

**CLARK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
COMP PLAN UPDATE
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2003**

Public Services Building
BOCC Hearing Room, 6th Floor
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA

6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The public hearing of the Clark County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman, Vaughn Lein. The hearing was held at the Public Services Building, BOCC Hearing Room, 6th Floor, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dick Deleissegues, Lonnie Moss, Ron Barca, Jeff Wriston, Vice Chair; Jada Rupley, and Vaughn Lein, Chair.

Members Absent: Carey Smith.

Staff Present: Rich Lowry, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney; Patrick Lee, Long Range Manager; Bob Higbie, Assistant Long Range Manager; Evan Dust, Program Manager II; Oliver Orjiako, Senior Planner; Derek Chisholm, Planner II; and Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant.

Other: Cindy Holley, Court Reporter.

GENERAL & NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Agenda for October 16, 2003

The agenda for October 16, 2003, as approved as distributed.

B. Communications from the Public

None.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

A. UPDATE OF CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, continued from September 25, 2003:

PLEASE NOTE: This hearing will focus on testimony from property owners on requested changes in land use designations and then focus on Comp Plan Text and Code Revisions.

Clark County is updating its Comprehensive Plan. As part of this effort, the Clark County Planning Commission will be holding a hearing to take testimony on, and make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding update to the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. At this hearing, the following will be considered:

- Proposed changes to the 20-Year Comprehensive Growth Management Plan text and policies contained within.
- Proposed Comprehensive Land Use and Zoning Maps for unincorporated rural and resource lands, and maps establishing expanded Urban Growth Area boundaries and providing plan designations for unincorporated lands within such boundaries for each of the following cities in Clark County: Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Vancouver, Washougal, and Yacolt.
- Implementation Measures - Proposed zoning ordinances and other measures necessary to implement the Comprehensive Plan.
- Capital Facilities Plans and supporting documents.
- A Final EIS issued on the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for Clark County and cities within the county.

Staff Contacts: Patrick Lee, (360) 397-2375, Ext. 4112 or Bob Higbie, 397-2375, Ext. 4113.

LEIN: This is a continuation, one of several, I imagine it's going to go on for a little while. What we try to do is let you know how far we think we're going to get through the evening. Our plan this evening is to continue on and get through the individual sign-ups for people with special property cases. We have a sign-up sheet here that we received last time, as well as I think the time before. We're going to get through those and we hope to get into the comp plan as well as possible code changes tonight.

If you're here for a facilities plan, we will not be getting to the facilities issues tonight, we hope to get to those next week, so we'll continue to monitor that. If we see that we're running slower than what we're estimating, and we will stay with the five minute rule, we would appreciate any of your testimony be limited to five minutes or less, that would be great. So before I start calling the names, Mr. Lee, is there anything staff has to say at all?

LEE: No. We gave the presentation last week so we're ready to go.

LEIN: All right. Is Bruce Neill here? Do you have testimony?

NEILL: Yes.

LEIN: Please come up and state your name and address for the record, please.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

NEILL: Right here?

LEIN: Yes, please.

NEILL: My name is Bruce Neill and I have a couple of different properties that I have before you this evening. I work for Neill Real Estate Services at 12913 NE 41st Street, Vancouver 98682.

The first property that I have before you is SSR2003-038A, I submitted a letter on September 19th with exhibits. This is 3.15 acres. It's located at 5820 NE 8th Court, Serial Number 147576-005. The current designation, land use designation, is for Urban Medium with the zoning of R-18. The property is currently used as a storage facility, Lockaway Storage, which has 549 storage units. The surrounding properties are to the north, immediately to the north is the BPA power lines. North of that is zoned commercial. East is vacant, the Bonneville Power Administration owns property to the east of that that they use for a yarding area. To the south is the Burlington Northern Railroad and then adjacent to that is the City of Vancouver office commercial, and then west is Highway 99 and on the west side of Highway 99 is commercially zoned property.

What we're requesting is that the comp plan be changed to general commercial and the zoning to limited commercial. And the reasons are as follows: This storage facility was built in the mid '80s and it has been a storage facility since that date. The comprehensive plan was at that time commercial with a zoning of limited commercial. Apparently the comprehensive plan change was or was changed to urban medium with an R-18 zone the last comprehensive plan update and the property owners were out-of-state owners and they were not aware of this, and so when they hired me this last year we talked about a number of things. One of the things we talked about was this specifically and I said this was the forum to make this request to take it back to commercial.

As you can see on the map the property is zoned the urban medium and urban medium does not allow for storage facilities. Commercially zoned, a CL zone or a CH zone,

would allow for these type of storage facilities so that the property once the comprehensive plan was changed and the zone was changed is now a nonconforming use. That is something that happened to their property as a result of the comprehensive plan change, not anything that they did. What we're requesting is something that would bring the existing use back into a conforming type of a use.

There are some concerns that the owners have with regard to this. One of the concerns is what were to happen if they had some kind of natural disaster and had to go in there and rebuild that, now they're requesting a nonconforming use in that zone and would they be allowed to do that. Additionally, if they were looking at doing some additions or remodeling of that would they be able to do that. It does not fit into the part of the zone to do what they want to do with their property. Additionally, as you can see from the map there the R-18 zone and the urban medium zone is kind of an isolated island surrounded by commercially zoned property. The fact is is this property does not have any benefit for multi-family use. You've got Burlington Northern Railroad on one side, you've got Highway 99 on the other, you've got the Bonneville power lines running on the north side, you've got a yarding area on the other side and it's not, it just does not suit multi-family. Additionally, this property has many, many years of life left in it, it's not something that is going to be torn down in the near future, it has decades of life left to it.

So for the above reasons we are asking that the Planning Commission would consider this request and return it back to the zone it was before the last comprehensive plan amendment. Are there any questions on this property?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Neill on this particular case?

MOSS: Does this request include the R-22 triangle down there below the R-18?

NEILL: They own to the Burlington Northern, so, yes.

LEIN: Thank you. You indicated you had another?

NEILL: Yes, I do. The second property that I have is SSR2003-046 and is located out in the Dollars Corner area. The property address is 21108 NE 72nd Avenue, Serial Number 192929-000. It is 9 acres. It is currently zoned or the land use designation of Rural Center Residential with a zone of RC-1. The current use of the property has an older single-wide mobile home and the balance of the property is pasture. The properties to the north are commercial, there's a commercial shop on the adjacent property to the north. To the west is a commercial convenience store. To the -- immediately to the south is a house with some outbuildings and then also commercially designated property south of that.

We are requesting that this property be changed to rural center commercial and with a zoning of CR-2. This is a strip of residential property that is sandwiched between commercial, commercially zoned properties with the one-acre minimum on this, for you

to go through and try to create a residential atmosphere sandwiched in between commercially zoned properties would not be marketable. What we're looking at is if that eastern line of the CR-2, even if that were just extended to the south you'd have more of a conformity of commercial uses out there and more usable area. Additionally, with the interchange at I-5 and SR-502 scheduled for construction in 2006 and the widening of SR-502 scheduled for 2007, there's going to be greater traffic volumes which will create greater commercial needs and it is our feeling that this property would be able to help serve those commercial needs. Lastly the -- again I'd just like to stress that having a residential property sandwiched between commercial zones like this does not lend itself to a marketable residential development. Are there any questions with regard to this?

MOSS: Is it your suggestion to include that property to the south of this one, the small property just north of the CR-2?

NEILL: We don't have control over that property so I can't speak for that, that owner, so it would seem like a logical thing to do.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Neill.

NEILL: Thank you.

BARCA: Question for staff. Mr. Neill's first property they brought forward I couldn't find it in the record for record number, I didn't find the second one as Number 97.

LEE: It is, which -- do you have the notebook of the table showing the site-specific requests? It's 2003-038A was the first one.

BARCA: Yeah. But we're getting this as far as a cross-reference goes?

LEE: Okay, let me see if I can locate it. Number 35 perhaps, it would have been in the packet you received a couple meetings ago. No, you're correct, this is just a different index of the written testimony that's been submitted, your letter that you referenced.

BARCA: All right. So it's Number 35, I overlooked it. Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Neill. Gary Boldt. Paul DeBoni.

DEBONI: Evening members of the Planning Commission. I'm Paul DeBoni, 2817 NE Ingle Road, Vancouver, I'm a member/manager of Green Mountain Ventures LLC, developers of Green Mountain property. As you heard at one of your earlier hearings this property which is approximately 450 acres was requested by the City of Camas for inclusion within their urban growth area. Provided some materials here for you to review, including some maps, so I'll try to be as brief as I can in my presentation.

The property has been subject to development planning for almost 10 years. In 1994 it was submitted for a conditional use permit for a public golf course. At that time a full environmental impact statement was prepared for the property and finalized by the County that anticipated full development and build-out of the property at urban uses. At that time we were looking at a master plan resort concept which would have included a hotel conferencing center. After deliberation and discussion with public officials we decided instead that it would become more logical to, for it to become part of the urban area of Camas. We've worked the last several years with the City, over the last year analyzed their urban growth needs and I think the City concurred with us that it was the most logical place for them to accommodate the projected urban growth needs that the city of Camas has.

The property is essentially a turn-key piece for them in that we're currently served with a City of Camas water main onto the property that's sized to facility development of the full build-out development. Their sewer line is adjacent to the property, about a 1200 foot extension into the property is all that would be necessary. We also have two high production wells that would be of interest to the City, as well as a 700-foot elevation location on Green Mountain itself which is the only 700-foot elevation in the north quadrant of the Camas water service district that would afford the location for a reservoir that the City needs for its future loop service for the north end of Camas. The property does include Green Mountain itself, a 900 foot cinder cone, the property line goes over the top. It also includes a portion of Camas -- of Lacamas Creek that runs through the southwest corner of the property. 57 acres of that land is in a conservancy with an agreement between Fish and Wildlife Service a nature conservancy for maintenance of a couple of endangered species plants on the property. There are two large areas; one adjacent to Ingle, the other at the corner of Ingle and Goodwin which are flat, easily developable sites that the City has indicated an interest in developing as commercial pads at some point. So the property is a unique piece.

As you see on the maps that we presented, access to the property of course will be afforded through the new 192nd Street interchange as soon as that opens, will come directly up to within nine-tenths of a mile of the site, so regional transportation will be easily afforded to the site. The golf course itself was built in 1999. We've been operating it now as an 18 hole course that's been open to the public since that time. The configuration of the golf course is essentially like a doughnut with anticipation of development within the property. In anticipation of that sewer lines were installed, dry sewer lines, under all of the fairways in order to make the property essentially turn-key in operation. The northern end of the property is bounded by two subdivisions, one of which we developed in one-acre lots called Mountain Glen, and to our west are is two active recreational water ski lakes. So the property essentially creates for itself something of a natural location for a northern terminus of the urban area of the city of Camas. We've anticipated a mixed use plan for the property and we've also submitted with that preliminary plan what would look like would be. We've been in discussion with a number of different potential users of the site, including two hotel conferencing users

who are interested in locating on the property.

So in summary I think this provides a unique opportunity for the City of Camas with very little cost in terms of infrastructure, or if any, a significant addition to their tax base, an opportunity for some additional high density development, residential development that would carry their projected need for some 6 unit per acre type of residential development as well. So if there's any questions I'd be certainly glad to answer them.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. DeBoni?

BARCA: I have a question concerning the aspect of mixed use. Besides the hotel, golf, residential, do you foresee any other type of utilization?

DEBONI: We're looking at at least at two major commercial pads as well as several locations which would probably integrate some business offices as well as some lower intensity type commercial development that would probably be in conjunction with some of the high density residential project.

BARCA: Something in the form of services for that residential?

DEBONI: Yes.

BARCA: Okay. And the commercial pads I suspect with this type of development you've kind of honed what type of client you want to put in there. Do you have a feel for what that would look like, then, out that far north of the city?

DEBONI: Not at this time. We've had some preliminary discussions with the City and I think it was primarily the City's interest in some -- in these commercial pads at this time. We really haven't done an economic assessment of those yet.

BARCA: Okay.

LEIN: Other questions? Thank you, Mr. DeBoni. Vernon James. Denise Cobb. Oh, Mr. James.

COBB: Pass.

LEIN: When I call your name I'd really appreciate you coming up quickly because I'll move right over you if you don't.

JAMES: My name is Vernon James. I live at 21512 NE 10th Avenue in Ridgefield. That's -- the address is actually just south of 219th.

LEIN: Would you mind sitting down and speaking into the mic so people can hear you, please.

JAMES: And the property I own, I have 17 acres there at Duluth corner, my son and I own it together, and about a year ago I applied to get R-1 designation, which it's R-5 right now, my lawyer said that the rural center R-1 would be what he applied for, and at the time they said there was no need for any additional houses in the area, but I see now there's houses going in directly north of me maybe a quarter of a mile on the same side of the road, and I stopped in and talked to the builder and he told he had one-acre houses, eight of them, could have sold them two or three times over. So I just kind of questioned why they can get it north of 219th, but I can't get any designation like that south of 219th. So I have no intention of building a housing tract, but I'd like to sell a couple of acres to retire and at this point in time I can't do that and I would like to try and get it reconsidered or considered, whichever the case may be, for it -- to rezone that to rural center R-1 lots.

LEIN: Rural center, what was the, R-1?

JAMES: Yes.

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

JAMES: Thank you.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. James? Lonnie.

MOSS: Just a comment. And that's that Duluth hasn't as yet been designated as a rural center so it would take that before we could give it that kind of zoning. For your information, you referred to the development to the north along 10th Avenue on the west side that's one (inaudible) is doing.

JAMES: Yes. Maybe a quarter of a mile north of me, yes.

MOSS: That's actually a cluster development of a 100-acre property so those are clustered lots in lieu of 5-acre lots, leaving a big remainder which is permitted in the R-5 zone. So you may want to consider doing something like that.

JAMES: Some of it is considered to be left alone entirely or something of that nature, is that what you're saying?

MOSS: Yeah, the cluster development ordinance allows you to do one cluster lot per 5 acres of gross property area as long as you leave a remainder of at least 55 percent.

JAMES: So that would be the way I'd have to do it if I did something like this to get in?

MOSS: I guess my point would be that this Planning Commission wouldn't have the authority to grant or even recommend the zoning that you've requested in the absence of designation of Duluth as a rural center and that would be -- that isn't something that's on the table right now.

JAMES: Well, that's just my lawyer's suggestion. I don't know anything about the rule, but he said that might be the best way to do it so that's what we did and it was turned down and for the reason there was no need at that time, and then I see this other housing tract going in so I thought maybe I'd --

LEIN: You might want to meet with staff and find out what other opportunities you have for that property that wouldn't require something such as the rural center. They'd be happy to meet with you.

JAMES: Thank you.

LEIN: Okay. Ms. Cobb, did you say no?

COBB: No, thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Jerry Winters.

WINTERS: Pass.

LEIN: Thank you. H.N. Hassold. Michael O'Connell. Scott Miller. Jim Walker. We're doing well. Rodney Smith.

SMITH: Yes. My name is Rodney Smith. I live at 26410 NE 10th Avenue. Last week, it's actually been several now, last week I stood before this committee and gave my statement of support for the City of Ridgefield's request for the expansion of and inclusion in the urban growth area along with Fire Station 12. Today I am here to request a zoning change. My property is located at 26410 NE 10th Avenue known as the old Pioneer Store. I respectfully request that the zoning be reverted back to rural commercial. The change in designation would allow me to pursue my original plans for use while future area plans are being developed and implemented.

My reasons for the request to change are based on several points, the first point being when I purchased the place it was represented as a commercial property with appropriate zoning by both the seller and the real estate agents. I later learned we were not designated commercial but Ag-20. Our three-quarter acre piece of ground is 50 percent paved with asphalt and marked "parking." It has expansive frontage to both South 5th and NE 10th Avenue with three driveways, two in excess of 75-feet wide, the third over 25 feet. The building covers another 15 percent of the ground space, leaving

about 10,000-square feet to farm. This is not a reasonable use for a property with a long history and layout for the requested rural commercial zoning.

To give a little history, in the early '20s the first building on my parcel was commercial in use and design. My home, the Pioneer Store, was a restaurant, market, post office and bus stop serving travelers driving old State Highway 99, now NE 10th Avenue, on their way to Seattle. The store has been operated in one commercial capacity or another up through the mid '90s. It was zoned as CR, rural commercial, in the first comprehensive plan adopted in 1980, then reclassified as Ag-20 in '94 while a listed business was still in operation. I have until this year been taxed as a rural commercial property by the County. In late '99 my wife and I bought our place to live in and operate a retail artist and craft studio. We simply wanted to run a small scale shop while living quietly amongst our neighbors in this peaceful community. When we made our plans none of the current growth had been proposed.

I began the process of getting the zoning changed in January of 2002. Since then four different commercial and public service projects have been undertaken on three of the borders of my property. All four have been approved in the time I have continued this process. The noise, traffic and dust have disrupted a once peaceful life-style. It would be prudent to grant my request based on current developments, public service operations and other businesses that border my property on all four sides. Currently 100 feet to the southeast is Mountain View Business Park with plans for expansion and a similar zone change request. Due south is the location for a new Clark Public Utilities electrical substation starting work in two weeks. Actually two days now. 300 feet to the southwest is the new Dollar Tree warehouse under construction. Directly to the west 40 feet are two County water wells. To the north behind me is the busy Fire District 12 station. I would not -- I should not be the only property unable to meet its full use and value potential when I am surrounded entirely by like activities.

My key points for granting the requested change for my property to rural commercial are: One, there is 80 years of commercial history on my property. Two, we have commercial buildings and landscape design with paved aprons and lined parking. Three, our inability to use our property as currently designated nor for the intended activities we purchased it for. Four, Clark County has kept us on the tax rolls as commercial until this year. Five, I was informed by planning staff that only property bordering an urban growth area would be considered for a zone change request, I have said boundary running across my boundary. Six, all the surrounding properties are used in a commercial manner. Seven, the area growth patterns prohibit resale at a fair market value as currently zoned. Eight, several other projects that affect us have cleared the approval process since I submitted my original request. Nine, our proposed use as commercial would not affect traffic, the environment, nor any surrounding residents unlike the existing projects and activities in the immediate area. And, ten, to use the city/county line as means to dispute the impact of area development or deny my request would be unjust as all the land in reference is also still in Clark County. The

disruptions and impacts do not recognize this line in the sand nor should the deciding parties. Please be thorough as you review the reasons I have presented for granting my request as you make a determination. I've also included the original letter of request for review. Thank you for your time.

I'd also like to read a couple portions of a letter drafted by Eric Eisemann. Basically I have the support of the City of Ridgefield behind me for the rezoning and in his letter, I'm just going to read portions to keep the time short, in May 2003 when I prepared staff analysis for all proposed site-specific UGA expansion requests, I measured each request against the approval criteria found in Clark County Comprehensive Plan Chapter 12. In that light my analysis of your property was as followed: Consistent with approval criteria. Criteria 3, the site is zoned Ag-20. Prior to '92 the site was zoned for rural commercial use. Staff does not believe the property warrants an Ag-20 zoning designation. Criteria 4, the City is extending water and sewer to Dollar Tree site on the south side of 5th Street. The site is adjacent to Fire District Number 12 Ridgefield station. Criteria 5, the site is developed and has been in commercial use in the past. There are some potential for redevelopment. Criteria 6, the Dollar Tree facility is under construction south of South 5th Street. The commercial use of this property is compatible with uses in the UGA. Criteria 7, the site does not contain any sensitive lands. Staff recommendation. Adding the property to the city's UGA would allow redevelopment of an existing commercial property consistent with Ridgefield urban area comprehensive plans. Although the Council now recommends a more streamlined UGA expansion than the one presented to Clark County in June, my professional evaluation of your request is unchanged.

Overall inclusion of your property and three other similarly situated properties into the Ridgefield UGA makes sense. These properties are approximately one acre or less, fully built out as part of Pioneer Corners area prior to County zoning being even established. Zoning these developed properties rural commercial made sense several decades ago, rezoning a one-acre parcel to Ag-20 in '94 when it is fully built out and committed to nonagricultural use makes no sense and I conclude the Ag-20 must be an oversight or mistake. Consequently, I think it reasonable to either bring the property into the Ridgefield UGA or rezone it back to rural commercial so it may continue to be used for such. Do you have any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Smith?

BARCA: I'm confused. We had testimony already that said that the property was appropriate to be brought into the Ridgefield urban growth area, now you want to go rural commercial. You don't anticipate that Ridgefield will get to you soon enough to allow you to do what you want?

SMITH: It's a backup plan. If I get into the UGA, I don't need the zoning change. If by chance Ridgefield's plan is denied, then I want to act on my own to become rural

commercial until said time.

BARCA: Okay. I think we've had enough testimony that from the fire station to the north all the way down to 259th there are affected parties that are asking for a lot of review of that territory, and I believe that along 10th there there will be a lot of scrutiny given, especially in the aspect of how it's going to dovetail in with Ridgefield's plan. I would suspect that this particular corner specifically where it is it won't be overlooked. What it will look like, I don't know. But with all that we've seen go on there, there will definitely be some type of action. As it is right now with the development that's going on we can't expect the neighbors in the adjacent areas to consider themselves living a rural life-style any longer, you're going to have enough light pollution that you'll be able to see the development all the way down to 50th or maybe 72nd and there will be truck noises that will be constant. So, yeah, I think when it comes to the aspect of impacts we genuinely understand how much this affects what choices you have as far as life-style.

SMITH: Thank you. I had received some correspondence saying that no change was being considered and that's why I came before you and that's why I'm very pleased to hear that it will be looked into further and scrutinized more closely. Thank you for your time.

LEIN: Thank you. Kylyn Johnson.

JOHNSON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Kylyn Johnson. I reside at 1410 NE 106th Street. I'm here as a property owner representing my neighbors Dennis and Karen Mason, American Properties LLC and myself to convince you that our properties better serve this community as commercial properties. The total area of properties before you that I've highlighted in green that are zoned R-22 are 5.92 acres, I represent the owners holding 5.14 of those acres. The other owners are Totem Industrial Park which owns three one-hundredths of an acre, it's a tiny little parcel that you'll see next to I-5 on the maps I gave you, and Margaret Hall, she owns .75 acres, it's right -- it's pretty much engulfed by Tenney Creek. And she is deceased, her estate is in probate, and as far as I know there's not enough property on her area or a buildable site on her property, it's all wetland. The properties owned by LLC, there's five of them, I don't know if you need to, if I need to read their lot numbers or anything, they own a total of 4.61 acres. They do business as Blackjack Fireworks right on I-5. Dennis and Karen Mason, and I've put their last name on the map I gave you, they own .23 acres, and my husband and myself own .3.

I'd like to give you a brief history. My husband purchased our property in 1981, American Properties LLC doing business as Blackjack Fireworks purchased the property at the end of the road a few years later. At that time all the properties that you're looking at in green now and the ones that are in yellow were zoned CH and the properties on the other side of the street, which is the south side of NE 106th, are light industrial. Following the comprehensive management plan, however, the properties

that are currently in green and the area that's highlighted in red were zoned R-22. The property that's highlighted in red was owned by a gentleman named Callahan. At that time none of the property owners knew that they were zoning -- they were changing the zoning designation. My husband built a 1500-square foot shop on our property hoping that some day he'd be able to open a shop himself. He built it in like '93 and in '95 the zoning went into effect. Blackjack Fireworks didn't have to, they still operate because they're grandfathered in, and Callahan was eventually able to get the property highlighted surrounded in red rezoned back to commercial and it currently serves as a mobile home park in Hazel Dell. I'm sure you've seen it, it's humongous. Under the Title 18 zoning, Chapter 18.33, residential districts are not only to provide for multiple family residential districts, but also to ensure compatibility with adjacent uses and such considerations as privacy, noise, lighting and design.

There's two components I think we need to look at. Currently the area that you're looking at is used by Blackjack Fireworks during their operations and there's some limits of the environment. What's highlighted, and I know it's on your map in yellow, but Blackjack Fireworks over the last few years has continued to purchase more properties in the area because there's not enough available parking and when the tent for the 4th of July committee went up on the opposite side of the street, on the south side, in the light industrial area, there continued to be a larger and greater, greater influx of traffic for the 4th of July and it there's we don't have enough accommodation for that traffic. We have an 18-foot wide road, the Clark County Fire Marshall has said that it doesn't meet code requirements, it has some sight distance issues, there's no shoulders and there's not, it's not safe as it is and traffic. Code Enforcement has, they've had continuing code enforcement problems since 2001 when they purchased the rest of the properties around us engulfing ours. You'll see on your map that's actually the map that they gave trying to get their new driveway permitted as a nonconforming use, so you'll see the, yeah, the driveway that goes up and around, they continually use this, it's been used for the last three years.

Since 1997 they purchased their existing property was already in effect with the two property, excuse me, three properties directly behind us were purchased and they used that as parking. When they purchased the property to east of us, they also continued to use that as property and they put in their new entrance and so their property alleviates a lot of the traffic congestion, so Code Enforcement has not shut them down because they see it's necessary in order to alleviate the traffic congestion, otherwise the traffic is totally blocked up and down highway -- or up and down NE 106th. The light industrial park across the street, it basically shuts down their operations because they have mostly semi-truck traffic and daily workers and things of that nature. So with the R-22 zoning we currently have code violations every year. Blackjack Fireworks continues to use the property. And you'll see that I've included in the packet I gave you Code Enforcement's notes. Next year they will shut down the entrance that they've created on the closest end of 106th, and once they do that all that traffic will be put back out on NE 106th, it will block the road and so any development that you could possibly have in

there for R-22 would be seriously impacted by the traffic and the normal uses of the area that's currently in existence.

We'd like to see the property zoned back to commercial, that way the code enforcement issues would be resolved, Blackjack's entrances and parkings would be, they'd go through the normal permitting process and be brought up to code because right now nothing that they have is up to code, it was all put in in violation and it just alleviate a lot of the problems that we have up in that area.

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Johnson? Do you have any input from the Blackjack people?

JOHNSON: They have information, both the Masons and Blackjack have all joined me in trying to get the property zoned back to commercial, some designation of commercial. Sandra Towne said CL is the closest thing to it that we could get, so we've all, we've all put together the plan to get it rezoned back. We're all on the same page.

LEIN: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? Doug Williamson. Doug Kolberg.

BOWLER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, my name is Rick Bowler, I'm here on behalf of Doug Kolberg and I'm here representing Parcels Number 105468 also known as parcel C, Mildred Hilberg, currently zoned R-18. Parcel 105459-010, also known as parcel D, also owned by Hilberg. I should say for the record my address is 313 SE 199th Avenue, Camas, Washington 98607. And parcels Number 105455 and 105459, also known as parcel E, Vera Woodruff, is zoned C-3.

This is a zone change request from commercial C-3 to R-18. These properties are contiguous with R-18 to the north, R1-7.5 to the west, with commercial on the corner of NE 76th and NE 94th Avenue. R-18 zoning is adjacent to parcel E on the west. Parcels C and D front on 94th Avenue, as does property A which is not a part of this request. Planning has determined that only one access will be allowed to 94th Avenue. The owner of parcel C, parcels C and D has the only existing access to NE 94th Avenue and the developer of parcel A has agreed to work with the owners of parcel C and D to utilize a common access point to 94th Avenue. The commercial utility for parcels D and E is limited due to the configuration of the commercial on the corner and will not be viewed as viable commercial parcels in the market. Development of parcel D as commercial would necessitate access through the adjacent residential neighborhood to the west. Parcels C, D and E are characterized as residential property due to the adjacent property configurations of both the commercial as well as the residential.

At the current time there is an existing conflict with Clark County with the development of parcels A and B as the County prefers a cross-circulation plan leading to NE 94th Avenue. This will be resolved with this zone change and development plan. The characterization of the residential neighborhood will be preserved and adverse traffic

impacts will be eliminated. It will plan for an improved traffic circulation pattern for existing as well as new development. It will allow for the development of these properties at their best and most viable economic manner. Any commercial development of these properties, even with the constraints outlined herein, would bring no impact for family wage jobs. I will respectfully entertain any questions.

LEIN: Are there any questions of Mr. Bowler?

BARCA: Mr. Bowler, do you have any input from the surrounding residential areas concerning this change?

BOWLER: The ones on property A and property B to the north are in favor of this to resolve the cross-circulation pattern. Property R1-7.5 to the west and R1-7.5 to the south of that are part of the development plan, and the R-18 property of course to the (inaudible) and 76th Street would be in favor of the process as well.

BARCA: Those are all of the affected properties as I see. I'm kind of looking --

BOWLER: Right.

BARCA: -- at the surrounding residential.

BOWLER: Right. Beyond the proposed development plan?

BARCA: Beyond the, yeah, the areas that are hatched on your map.

BOWLER: The only impact that we're aware of right now is the desire to get away from any commercial impact into the neighborhood, those circulation patterns.

BARCA: Thank you.

BOWLER: You're welcome.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Bowler.

BOWLER: Thank you for your time.

LEIN: Vernon James. Kamee Williams. Jan Vis. I'm sorry.

WILLIAMS: I'm Kamee Williams. I have some overheads, is there --

DUST: We can do that.

WILLIAMS: Okay, great. Katie, can you put the first one up, please. While they're

doing that, my name is Kamee Williams and I reside at 17401 NE Fourth Plain Boulevard in Vancouver. Oh, that's interesting the way that turned. Oh, that's better. Can you see the overheads? Can you? Oh, great, I wasn't sure if you could or not. My property is the one that's got the little box around it up at the top there and the street running just north of it is Fourth Plain Boulevard, running down the side this way is 162nd Avenue and you can see off to the little crook of Fourth Plain is 182nd, so that when I change between these slides if you can kind of remember that pattern because that will be the predominant thing that you'll be able to see in each one of them. Go ahead and put up the second one. I happen to live in the area that is under consideration for rezoning into business park. And this slide here or this overhead shows my property with the X on it and it shows the other properties in the area, and this came off your Web site for the County, this is the entire area, I guess, that's proposed for business park.

There are several reasons that I personally feel that this is kind of an illogical thing to do and I guess I kind of wanted to walk through those. Can you go ahead and put that one over the top of that one. The first thing I want to show you is the Lacamas Creek and Fifth Plain overlay on top of those properties so that you can see, very good, thank you, Sis, you can see kind of the squiggly lines there, the ones that's over the top of that, that happens to be Fifth Plain Creek on this side and it's Lacamas Creek on that side, both of which cross Fourth Plain Boulevard and my property sits in between those two creeks. Okay. So I just wanted you to note where the rest of the creek kind of goes. Again, these are maps that I got off of your County Web site.

The next slide better illustrates for you the environmental impact of the creek on this area. This whole area and that little dot there is my property, so again inside the green is the creek and that kind of shows you the riparian habitat. This happens to be the priority habitat conservation area that the County has designated as priority habitat, which means that it's governed by the habitat ordinance that's in place with the County and this ordinance says that the purpose is to protect environmentally distinct fragile and valuable fish and wildlife habitat areas for present and future generations while also allowing for reasonable use of private property. It further states: Within areas designated by this ordinance development or clearing activities which degrade habitat should generally be avoided where possible. In my opinion having acres of concrete business park in this area totally degrades this area, which is the whole reason why the ordinance was put in place in the first place. So that's one. You can see that there happens to be a priority species buffer on the outside there and again building, if there is any building that is to occur, it's generally not supposed to happen inside that priority species buffer, and if there is going to be some near there, then there needs to be an awful lot of mitigation measures put in place to make sure that it doesn't impact that environmental area. So I kind of wanted you to see the bigger picture and realize that almost the entire area of that section is impacted by this creek and this priority habitat conservation area.

Okay, go ahead and put up the next one, Sis. I also wanted to show you with this one that again that dot right there, that's kind of where the two creeks, thank you, that happens to be again my location of my property. I wanted you to see that again this whole area is located in the Lacamas Creek Basin and most of you are probably aware of what building in the watershed has done in the past to our county and why it's important that we take into consideration what we're doing in the future relative to building in these areas. These two creeks come together and it flows directly into Lacamas Lake and there's all kinds of concerns about, you know, pollution into Lacamas Lake and all the other problems that we've had there. So again, I wanted to point out that. Go ahead and put up the next one, Sis.

LEIN: Ms. Williams, could I ask you to slow down a little bit as you're speaking.

WILLIAMS: Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm a little nervous so.

LEIN: That's fine. You're doing fine.

WILLIAMS: I know I got five minutes so I was trying to go fast. This slide here shows my specific property and again Fourth Plain Road is just to the north of it and 182nd is the one that kind of jogs off to the, yeah, thanks. This shows the floodplain and the floodway and you can see where the, kind of the creek comes in and all of this area around my property is in, most of it is in the floodway or in the floodway fringe, and most of the rest of the property that is in the development area again proposed for business parks is also in the floodway or the flood fringe.

Okay, go ahead and switch. Turn it, there you go. Now I brought this one back again because I wanted to, oh, flip it over, there you go. Again the X is my particular piece of property and can you put the overlay on top of it with the creek just so that they can see that. What I wanted to point out here is a couple other things, and that is that when the City made the recommendation that this area be rezoned into a business park, they made some assumptions. One of the assumptions was that this area could be served by sewer and water. I have been told, and again I don't have any written documentation to show you tonight, but I have been told that if you look at the frontage road along Fourth Plain there, you'll see that there are very few properties, mine is one of them, that does have more than 7 acres which is the minimum requirement, site requirement for a business park, most of the rest of those properties are less than 7 acres so they don't meet the minimum for business park.

In addition to that, whatever sewer and water would need to come out there has to be a cost justifiable reason for it and if none of those properties on the frontage road are bigger than 7 acres and can't qualify for a business park, why would a developer want to go ahead and bring in water and sewer, why would the City want to do that for my lone property that sits between two creeks where potential for high cost of putting in pumping stations for sewer or other high cost relative to engineering the right type of, you know,

water and sewer systems would come into play. Across the street directly north of my property is one other parcel that is bigger than 7 acres. Again, it's on the east side of the creek. What I wanted to point out here is that the I'll call it a cluster subdivision for lack of a better word most of those homes in there are very expensive homes, in the 300,000 plus dollar range, they're not going anywhere soon, they are all less than 5 acres except for the one big parcel there. That one big parcel is, has legal covenants on it that prevents the owner of that property, who I believe was also the developer, from ever being able to develop it anything, into anything other than the rural acreage that it is right now. So supposedly even if business park zoning were allowed in that particular area, there are legal reasons why a developer couldn't buy it and put in a business park without, you know, severe ramifications with the other owners and stuff.

So anyway, with all of this I guess I just wanted to ask things that I've noticed in listening to the hearings is that when you have proposed something like this, you then put on urban holding or urban reserve statuses on pieces of property until you can take a look at that and my concern is that I've heard people come in here that have had urban reserve or urban holding on their properties for 10 plus years in this county before somebody has, you know, and nothing has been done and they're still asking to have some things done with it. My concern is that I don't want my property wrapped up in being proposed for a business park area if, one, somebody is not going to be looking at these things, these issues in the near future to make some relevant decisions on it. I personally feel that my property zoned Rural 5 is just exactly what it needs to be, it protects that habitat conservation area that we want to protect. I personally feel this entire area along that creek and in that conservation area does not warrant having a business park. I think there's lots of other areas than -- in the Lacamas Creek watershed to be putting business parks. Anyway, that's all I have to say. Do you have any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Ms. Williams?

WILLIAMS: Sorry I talk so fast.

LEIN: There's only one person that is concerned about that. Thank you.

BARCA: Good job with the maps, it was very helpful.

WILLIAMS: Thank you.

LEIN: Jan Vis. Rodney Troyer.

HANSEN: They had to leave to pick up their children, I'll speak for them.

LEIN: Are you going to speak for them this evening?

HANSEN: Well, I'm on there, I'm Harold Hansen, I'll wait for my turn.

LEIN: Okay, then you're next.

MOSS: Your turn has arrived.

HANSEN: First of all I got to say I admire you fellas, you know, that the game's going on and I'm thinking that if Boston loses it's going to be my fault and so because I wasn't there to watch the game, see. My name is Harold Hansen and my address is 9901 NE 170th Street in Battle Ground, Washington, and I'm here to -- I took a look at the Battle Ground urban reserve and was surprised to find out that I'm zoned industrial and so I'm speaking now for myself and for my neighbors. We have -- there isn't a home in that area that is probably under 450 and we're right next to, we are -- in fact that is that industrial area actually touches onto where the Parade of Homes was, what, four years ago. And I know what happens, you need to have the industrial in there, but I would like to have that changed, I would like my home and those of my neighbors to remain residential. That's it. Any questions?

WRISTON: What did you say the value? I missed the value of the homes there.

HANSEN: About 450 I would say is the least on any of them.

WRISTON: And where is the area, Evan? Do you have a better --

MOSS: The south end of Meadow Glade.

WRISTON: Okay, that middle, okay, those lots that --

DUST: That's 179th right there.

WRISTON: Right. Right. So the area we're talking about, though, is the purple one that's circled there; right?

HANSEN: Well, it's just the one part there --

WRISTON: Right, just that one.

HANSEN: -- the rest of it's all open, but that particular piece I had 20 or 40 acres in there a while back and it's just I split it up back before '90.

WRISTON: Okay. About eight homes?

HANSEN: Yeah.

WRISTON: Thank you.

BARCA: So, Harold, if it was industrial on each side of those properties, that wouldn't bother you either?

HANSEN: To tell you the truth, Ron, I don't really think it will ever be that way, but I know they need their percentages. I don't think that I'm not going to make them change anything, you know, except for that. But I don't think that will ever happen. You know, I just I don't think it will ever be industrial.

LEIN: Mr. Hansen, you're speaking for the Troyers also?

HANSEN: Yes, the same thing.

WRISTON: I got to remember to check my home, I hadn't thought about that.

LEIN: Any other questions of Mr. Hansen?

MOSS: Just --

WRISTON: That's scary.

MOSS: -- so I understand, Harold, your request is to remove that industrial designation just to the west of 102nd Avenue where the whole strip is?

HANSEN: Well, there's one section there that, so that would stop just the one section is all that I'm concerned about really. I just want it to remain the residential. I believe it's around what is it RS residential estates or I believe is what it is right now.

LEIN: Thank you, sir.

WRISTON: Thank you.

LEIN: We're on to new sign-up sheets and some people are designated that they are here for the comp plan only or the text and policies only, some haven't, so what I'd like to do is read some names and if you would like to speak for individual parcels, I'd like you to come forward; if not, then we'll continue on as we get to you. Jeffrey Mayhook.

MAYHOOK: Here for an individual parcel.

LEIN: Okay, please come forward. Mr. Horenstein.

HORENSTEIN: Policies.

LEIN: Okay. Harold Hansen, he just left. Mr. DeBoni has left. That's fine.

MAYHOOK: Good evening. My name is Jeffrey Mayhook, I'm an attorney from La Center, Washington. I'm here this evening with Mr. Bill Roher, who with his brother John operates a dairy farm in Ridgefield at the location that was discussed earlier with the gentleman that was here with the Pioneer Store and so I'll start with that point because I appreciate the observation that this is kind of ground zero for a lot of activity.

The Roher farm is a rectangular 40-acre parcel, they've been at it for over 25 years, they tell me they're still getting the same price for milk that they were getting back in 1978, which I think is indicative of their situation. They are one of more than a little more than a mere handful of dairy farms left in the county and what they see going on around them scares the Dickens out of them because they're already battling in trying to make a go of a what could be charitably described as a legacy business, and so they would like to take their Ag-20 parcel which is at 26821 NE 10th and they would like to have it included in the urban growth boundary for the city of Ridgefield. In the alternative, and just to eliminate any confusion, in the alternative, and at the very least, they would request designation as either light industrial or industrial park reserve and we'll just refer to that as "urban reserve" for the rest of our remarks.

The property in question has a frontage of 660 feet. It is directly across the street from the District 12 fire house, it is served by a three-inch gas line, it's a mere 500 feet from the Dollar Tree project which has shot out of the ground and in my experience what seems to be light speed and it's a huge 57-acre parcel and it is a harbinger of things to come. And the impacts to the Rohers are not just that they're concerned about becoming a landlocked agricultural property, they rely on surrounding parcels for lease purposes to do things like grow corn to support their operation and all of those properties are being teed up for inclusion in the urban growth boundary. Our situation is somewhat ambiguous. We appreciate the level of scrutiny that you have that faces you on this whole area of the county. Our situation is ambiguous because we went through the process with the Ridgefield Planning Commission and also the City and Ridgefield did adopt Resolution No. 253 which we only just received a copy of and I would like to get a copy to you by tomorrow, along with a letter that we submitted yesterday that I think is already in your packets to supplement the record.

This resolution, which was moved and accepted by Ridgefield back in June, accepted the Roher property which is adjacent to the Walker farm, which I'm sure you have already heard about or will hear more, their property is adjacent to the Walkers and there was basically both properties were included in a resolution that classified them, put them into the urban growth area and classified them as a UH-20X parcel with stipulations that their properties would be developed for industrial or office type nonresidential uses and retained in larger lots. There was additional stipulation by the City but as I indicated, I'll get you that resolution tomorrow. We're cognizant of the fact that the area is changing and it may be changing so rapidly that, you know, because of

that people may tend to want to be overly cautious or otherwise.

My view of the Roher situation is that they have almost in a kind of romantic fashion toiled away as family farmers to a point of near exhaustion and reality, a sense of pragmatism, that has now overcome them puts them in a situation where they have to start thinking long-term, and as this process in and of itself is long-term they request that you put them in the urban growth boundary consistent with the City of Ridgefield's original finding. I'm not sure that finding was presented to the Planning Commission, but given their proximity to the Dollar Tree project, given the proximity to other lands that are teed up for similar zoning changes, and more importantly because as I think was indicated by a prior speaker these things take lead time, it's the change here, inclusion in the urban growth boundary, is not going to result in having their dairy operation leveled tomorrow, next week, next month or even next year, the fact of the matter is it's going to take them some time to develop a business plan, attract the kind of venture financing that is necessary and your putting them in the urban growth boundary will allow them to start that process, to attract investors and develop a property that is more consistent with the use in that area.

And so in closing, they're feeling the impact, they basically are here before you, John couldn't make it tonight because somebody always needs to be on the farm, but they're here before you because this is a matter of consequence to them and we appreciate your time and attention, and not only this evening but in the future as you look at this area. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Mayhook or Mr. Roher? Thank you very much.

ROHER: Thank you.

LEIN: I'm going to go down through some additional names here so I find out how many are here for the site-specific. Mr. Langsdorf, site-specific?

LANGSDORF: Potentially.

LEIN: Okay. Bryan Snodgrass. Bryan left. Virginia Lear.

LEAR: Here.

LEIN: Site-specific?

LEAR: Wind Song Acres.

LEIN: Okay, thank you. Patrick Therien.

THERIEN: Here. Therien. No.

LEIN: Therien, okay. On anything?

THERIEN: Just a general comment, not a site-specific.

LEIN: Okay. George Sabin.

SABIN: Yes.

LEIN: Site-specific?

SABIN: Site-specific.

LEIN: Okay. Mr. Langsdorf, please.

LANGSDORF: Mr. Chairman, my name is Michael Langsdorf. My residence is 3923 Wauna Vista, Vancouver, Washington. I'm speaking as one thing to clear up a misunderstanding that I may have presented to you a week ago and also speaking in favor of a farm that I own in the Ridgefield area. 30 years ago I helped draft something called an FX amendment when I was sitting in Rich Lowry's chair. We also adopted at that time water and sewer guidelines for Clark County. At that time no one would have anticipated that our county would have grown to the size it is. We are now faced with a 10 and 20-year mandated planning process. Each of the cities in the county have presented to you their best proposal based on their experience and input from interested residents of adjoining properties. They have tried to present you with plans based upon existing land use and future anticipated developments. Their plans have taken in consideration existing capital improvements, their plans have also been developed to take into consideration capital improvements which are intended to satisfy that growth that's on their boundaries.

On June 28th, if I could hand this to you, on June 28th the City of Ridgefield after having numerous hearings and after the Planning Commission having numerous hearings adopted a plan. Mr. Jeff Mayhook referred to that. The specific language, if I can, is found on Page 4. And those minutes are signed and according to Brian Wolfe, who is the attorney for the City of Ridgefield, that is still the plan that the City of Ridgefield has adopted, not the one that was passed out tonight by your staff. Now I think Ridgefield has developed this plan based on the existing utilities that are in the ground or close on at 10th Avenue. They've done it on a fire station that's located on 10th, they've done it on a PUD substation that is by Dollar Tree or starting next week and for me personally they've included several sets of wells that have been developed over the last 6 to 10 years to service that entire area, one of which is on my property. The map presented to you shows in pink the 50, approximately 50-acre horse farm that I have at that location. It was to me surprising to be speaking in front of the Ridgefield --

LEE: Excuse me, would it be helpful, Vaughn, do you just have one copy, Mike?

LANGSDORF: I've got --

LEE: If we could put it up on the projector so others could see.

LEIN: Mike, could you give it to Evan over here --

BARCA: Hand it to Evan.

LEIN: -- so that he can get it on the overhead.

LANGSDORF: Okay.

LEIN: Thank you.

LANGSDORF: Here's another one if you want it.

DUST: No, I think this one will work.

LANGSDORF: I don't know if you can see it. The area that comes down and out to 10th is existing city boundaries for the city of Ridgefield. The first motion made by the City of Ridgefield on your thing there says I move the City Council to include land, that's the one in green that went out and around and back up, down to, down, yes, that was originally approved, then the blue for Roher and Walker was approved, and then the -- and where I made a mistake when I projected -- talked to you last week is I said that I thought Helen's View was RH or Urban Holding 20, it was Urban Holding 10, which is contained in the document, so I wanted to correct that in regards to my presentation. Also, then, the Boschma approval was the land in between and it wasn't drawn on there because we didn't have that, we just got the minutes today. The minutes you have in front of you are signed minutes from Ridgefield. According to Brian Wolfe they have not changed; that is, the draft that has been presented.

And I did feel sort of funny when I was at the City Council meeting because the pink I did not speak in favor of it at all, I didn't even know it was coming up, but I can tell you that it's a horse farm now with horses being stored and using the arenas indoor and outdoor, but it is becoming very urban with the growth at the intersection of 259th and 10th Avenue. I'd ask you if you could to recommend that Ridgefield's 62603 Growth Management Plan be sent on to the County Commissioners with your approval so that they can plan for the future. Right now we have lands right up to 10th Avenue that are already within the city of Ridgefield. Thank you. Any questions? I apologize for misstating myself last time on Helen's View, we all thought it was (inaudible).

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Langsdorf? Thank you.

BARCA: I need a clarification.

LANGSDORF: Okay.

BARCA: Okay.

LANGSDORF: I'll try.

BARCA: I believe you stated that the last adopted boundary by the City of Ridgefield is what you're representing on this map in front of us?

LANGSDORF: If you would like me to I could get you a copy of the letter that Brian Wolfe gave me yesterday that said just that thing; that this, this is the approved plan of the City of Ridgefield. Furthermore, that I talked to one of the City Council members who called me recently and he said that they haven't changed this and Brian Wolfe says that they haven't changed this.

BARCA: And the date on that adoption is?

LANGSDORF: I'll give you a copy. It's the --

BARCA: No, I don't need a copy, I'll get one.

LANGSDORF: It's their minutes of June 26th, 2003. And it has four changes. One is what's in blue, one is what's in yellow, one is the Boschma and the urban reserve holding is or urban reserve I guess is what's included in inside the green.

BARCA: And then --

LANGSDORF: If you want me to I can read you the portion of it.

BARCA: No, thank you, I don't need that. But I do need to clarify then with staff, is this what we have record of? It looks dramatically different so.

LEE: I think as Evan mentioned in the work session I don't know if we have this, the resolution that Mike is referring to. It seems to me that I think that resolution was probably prepared when the City of Ridgefield was speaking to the Planning Commission about the selection of the preferred alternative and their preference for urban growth boundary expansion. Since that time, frankly, we are a little confused because we have heard them say they pulled back the boundary somewhat so it may be that it's something that there has not been a resolution passed forward, but it's being actively discussed at the Council. It may be that this is correct. We need to get some

clarification as well.

BARCA: Okay. Because Mr. Eisemann's testimony does not collaborate with what you're presenting to us.

LANGSDORF: Mr. Barca, if you can give me a fax number or I can send to you a copy of Mr. Wolfe's letter dated two days ago saying that this plan is still in existence. I've also had the same comments to me by Gary Holmberg, who's on their City Council, saying they haven't changed it.

BARCA: Well, anything that you have, please pass it through staff and then we'll get it on the record and --

LANGSDORF: Okay.

LEIN: Any other questions? Lonnie.

MOSS: Yeah, I do. If you could leave the map back up there. Mike, can you identify, what's the furthest east green line there? What street is that?

LANGSDORF: If I understand it, it was 20th Avenue and that's --

MOSS: 20th Avenue.

LANGSDORF: -- I think it says in the -- I think I gave that to Commissioner Chairman Vaughn Lein is I move that the City request the County to include land designated from 279th Street east to 20th Avenue, south to 249th, west to 10th and south to Carty Road to I-5 and then back to the city limits.

MOSS: Okay.

LANGSDORF: So that's their ordinance. I mean that's their motion, it's --

MOSS: And your property is on is that the south side of 259th Street?

LANGSDORF: My property is the pink, it's on the south side of 259th, yes.

MOSS: Okay, thanks.

LANGSDORF: I sort of felt like the cobbler who takes care of everyone else's shoes problems but his own kids.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Langsdorf.

LANGSDORF: Thank you.

LEIN: We're still on site-specific. Mr. Snodgrass, you stepped out, are you here for comp plan or site --

SNODGRASS: For policy.

LEIN: Policy, okay, thank you. All right. Virginia Lear or Steve Lear.

LEAR: Good evening. I'm Virginia Lear, Wind Song Acres, 17640 NE 120th Avenue in Battle Ground. We have a point of view on our side concerning Wind Song Acres. The Moon family last week said that we promised --

LEIN: Excuse me, Mrs. Lear, could you sort of try to get up closer to the microphone, please.

LEAR: Oh, I'm sorry.

LEIN: That's fine. You have a quiet voice and we need to hear you.

LEAR: We've been working on our plot for over 10 years. It's called Wind Song Acres. Again, we've been here many times. Last week Mr. and Mrs. Moon said that they had their point of view, this is ours concerning Wind Song Acres because when we sold them their one acre place we made it clear they could be a part of a gated community, they wanted to be a part of our gated community which we've been working hard to get. They came, they went to the meetings with us, they knew when we were accepted to be a private road this would be 177th Circle, we gave them access from their property to that street just for the reason of being part of that gated community. We went through all the County fees, we went through all the changes to make it a gated community and they wanted to be a very much a part of it.

When it came down to providing -- signing the road maintenance they denied signing the -- they didn't want to sign it, they wanted to be a part of the gated community, have the private road and have everything for free. They didn't know all the costs that we had encountered getting it to be a private road, getting the cost of the gate, getting everything in line, they would not sign, so we let it, we could not do that. So the bigger lots we could not sell because there was not the opportunity for the people to come and buy them. They wanted a gated community, the County said everybody on that road had to sign it, so we were denied our private road. Then we told them we were going to have to go to a developer because we were so far into it we had to sell it. So we were up front with them from the start.

So mainly I'm letting -- I'm saying this tonight so as it's on record, we tried everything to keep it into two and a half acres and it didn't work. And now we have a proposal from a

developer, they are going to buy it if we can keep it into low density residential on our Wind Song Acres and have it highway commercial, which would help the County a whole lot. From 179th Street down 120th there's about 700 feet of highway facing 503 there that can be very nice highway commercial which is jobs and the low density housing makes it good for homes and so our property can still be used for homes and it will still bring in jobs. Thank you.

LEIN: Are there any questions of Mrs. Lear?

LEAR: We have these here, that's our letter source because if I didn't make any sense, it's written out for you folks. Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you very much. Steve Lear, did you want to make some comments? George Sabin.

SUNDAL: I'm not George Sabin but I hope to do a fair job of representing George tonight, George is a little under the weather. My name is Jim Sundal, I work with Coldwell Banker, my business address is 14201 NE 20th Avenue, Salmon Creek. The parcel we're talking about tonight belongs to Mr. Sabin. It's located at the corner of NE 10th Avenue and NE 219th Street, which as we all know is the main intersection accessing Battle Ground and it defines Duluth. It's sort of an odd little parcel because it is right now designated as mixed use, two acres of it abutting 219th Street being CR-1 designation and the remainder of it being a residential designation and in this case it's R-5. The other point I'd like to bring up that seems to be relevant here is that there is a plan in place with funding according to the Department of Transportation of Washington to establish an I-5 interchange and the current drawing of that includes a straightaway or a thoroughfare through 219th, through the intersection and straight over to Interstate 5. There's some Gee Creek issues that I know exist and things like this, but this is going to be eventually a highway commercial area.

Mr. Sabin is a well-known builder and developer and he has plans to make this a very well used and of high use area in terms of providing some commercial or I should say, what do we call this, George, yeah, commuter commercial services in the area. This is one of the drawings. I might point out that this parcel is serviced currently by CPU water and we've also got power to it. There is no sewer besides storm sewer in the area, but that evidently is going to be part of the plan for either Hazel Dell or Ridgefield, depending on who accesses that area eventually. But this particular drawing shows that there is plenty of greenbelt space that Mr. Sabin's reserved for a parking area for the commercial site. And obviously we've only got two acres which is only the lower quarter of this to the lower right-hand side, but these projects take sometimes years to develop obviously. We've got principals to find, we've got buy in to find and you can't simply put up an advertisement that you're looking to build a commercial area like this without the commercial designation already in place. All of the buildings that you see here are by definition in the CR-1 category permitted without a conditional use, but this

is the vision for this area at this point.

I also wanted to point out as a technicality here for the record we originally wrote in, this letter was supposed to have gotten here in July, but due to some misunderstanding between myself and Mr. Sabin it got here earlier this month. We're lucky that it got into the record, but it's Number 128 in that large pile with the pink papers between it. So that was our original shoe in on this, but Mr. Sabin also wrote a narrative here that I'd like to read for the record. "I respectfully request the Commission consider including the subject property," and by the way the parcel number if you didn't catch it was 217136 "in the current proposed urban growth boundary. It's located within 20 blocks of the current proposed boundary line. With the advent of the I-5 and 219th Interchange scheduled for 2006 start it would seem advantageous for the County to anticipate the impact the interchange will have on the immediate area. Two of the 8 acres of the subject property currently zoned commercial CR-1, I propose the remaining acreage be rezoned to a commercial designation, preferably highway commercial or similar designation, in keeping with the County's master plan. The site has over 300 feet of frontage on both 10th Avenue and 219th Street, access from both streets could easily accommodate, could be easily accommodated with efficient turn lanes on property that would be donated to the County or State. The property is currently serviced by all utilities, and of course that's with the exception of sewer at this point. The current site plan anticipates substantial natural greenbelt buffers. It seems prudent to anticipate the need for commuter commercial services to accommodate the expected traffic with the completion of the I-5 Interchange, rezoning the remaining 6 acres of subject commercial designation would be the highest and best use of the property and would help meet the anticipated needs for the commercial services." Anything to add, George? Questions?

SABIN: No (inaudible).

BARCA: How many acres is this particular parcel?

SUNDAL: 8.

BARCA: That's 8. Any thought towards business park designation?

SUNDAL: We haven't thought about that, no.

BARCA: Think about it.

MOSS: It's outside the urban growth boundary.

BARCA: Lots of things are at the moment.

MOSS: Yeah, this is a stretch though.

SUNDAL: Yeah, this is a 20 block stretch. It's always amazing to me, and no carve on the County or anything here, but, you know, when the funding is there for an interchange and of something this large that the urban growth boundary doesn't include some of this growth that's obviously going to happen and it's impossible, of course, for an entrepreneurial like Mr. Sabin to go ahead with a project that might take several years in finding the funding and the principals to go ahead with something like this in anticipation of that. So I hope that you will give it your utmost consideration and thank you for your time and timeliness. Good night.

LEIN: I think that concludes the sign-up sheets on site-specific. Is there anyone in the audience wishing to testify on any other site-specific? Please come forward and state your name and address.

SMOKEY: I don't know why I wasn't on the list. I spoke with staff on the phone and I was at a meeting two weeks ago and signed up then, couldn't get to make it because of the number of sign-ups that were there. In fact I was asked to be here at 5:30 and here it is now 10 after 8:00 so I don't know what happened there. My name is Mike Smokey. I live at 16702 NE 78th Street. That is the site-specific address I'd like to speak about today. Could you move it up a little bit if you could. I'm also here on behalf of my two neighbors to the east of me. You can see the subject property there where the dot is and the two little asterisks, my two neighbors, the Jones and the Hurleys. I didn't bring my parcel or serial number, but those three properties I do believe are on the site-specific request map as part numbers 034. We have 5 acres. The existing use as you can see by the map is zoned as agricultural. The 5 acres is our residence and it's also a little mini farm.

A little bit of history. We moved there in 1988. When we moved there the property to the west of us was the Germann's dairy farm. The property to the south of us was the Jensen's dairy farm and you can't see that on the map. The property to the south is now two schools, that's the Heritage and the, excuse me, the Frontier and Pioneer schools. As you can see directly to the east is the Germann development and then a little bit to the southeast of us right there you can see next to the school property is the Snyder development. So when we we first moved there in '88 on our little road there was only three houses, us and two others. And in fact the Hurleys at the end weren't even there at that point in time.

So when we moved there, you know, there was cows around us, we had cows, it was kind of a little nice agricultural dairy area, but since then we've been encroached upon significantly. There's probably 500 new houses around us. The property, my property, is bounded by both sides of the urban growth boundary as it exists. To the immediate south is the business park zoning or what is currently maybe to be the urban or the business park zoning that was spoken to earlier this evening and that lady did bring up some of the thoughts that I had also is that is the drainage for the Fifth Plain Creek and the Lacamas Creek. Those three properties that are on the map are flat. There is no

wetlands issues with those, and there is also water and sewer stubbed on 78th Street and then also in the middle of that subdivision there's another stub at the north end of my property.

We first put in an informal request back in 2002, a little more formal request in 2003 and I thought maybe the Commission would like to see a face to the request and hear a little bit of the testimony in person. And maybe as a sidebar if you could go to the other overhead, a couple of weeks ago Randy Printz, Esquire discussed the Gramor property that there's a dot there in the middle of that and they requested a rezone change from residential to commercial to fit the commercial that's just to the west of that little square, and my thinking is if the Commission decides to grant that, then the 20 acres that we're talking about my property and the neighbors may represent the residential in-fill you need to take care of that commercial request for the Gramor.

Some of the other things for the rational change, look at my notes here real quick if you don't mind. Like I said, the property is adjacent to the urban growth area as it is now. You can see it's highly parcelized next to it as it now exists so it would be consistent with the growth. Like I said, the sewer and water are already there. The three properties that are in question are on Plan Number 1 of the five proposals to be brought into the urban growth. Like I said, it may help with the fit of the Gramor project. And then we've also found that as being agricultural we did run some cattle on that property with the advent of the subdivision right next to us, the only thing is a buffer, a barbed wire fence, it really isn't conducive to have the two side-by-side, the cattle became an attractive nuisance, so kind of at the request of my insurance agent we quit having cows because I got tired of the kids coming through the fence wanting to come see the cows and we do have some problems with, you know, neighbor dogs chasing horses and that kind of thing. So it's that kind of a buffer right between Ag and, you know, R-1, isn't all that conducive, so it seems to me that with the sewer already there, being on the edge of the urban growth, and I know that Ron does have some concerns with, you know, what kind of properties are right along the urban growth already, we could already bring in to help some of that issues of the in-fill and I think those three would be a prime example. With that I'll conclude my testimony.

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Smokey? Mr. Smokey, I'd have to apologize, you were on the list, I'm not used to seeing a typed name so I couldn't read it. So I apologize, it's not staff, it was me.

SMOKEY: Very good.

LEIN: Thank you.

SMOKEY: Apology accepted.

WISER: That's my fault, I put him on first tonight.

SMOKEY: Oh, I've been waiting for two and a half hours. Thank you much.

LEIN: Thank you. Yes, sir.

BATEMAN: Good evening. My name is George Bateman. I actually was on the list two weeks ago, but I couldn't come last week so I may have been passed over somewhere in this process so. Okay. And I live at 3411 NE 179th Street, the postal district is Ridgefield. And my property is actually adjacent to the urban growth boundary at this juncture. There's the urban growth boundary runs through the middle of 34th Avenue which is a private road there south of 179th Street and the Parcel Number is 181749. Oh, thank you.

DUST: Get the right lamp here and we'll be all set.

BATEMAN: Yeah, where the black dot is, that's my property. And it's four and a half acres so and it's currently designated UR-10 and I'm requesting that it be changed to residential. And I suppose I'm, it's more my question to you is that the expansion of the urban growth boundary that's currently being proposed goes to 29th Avenue, but in 2005 179th Street is going to be widened going to 50th Avenue and yet none of the properties from 29th to 50th Avenue that are currently urban reserve are being planned to be moved within the urban growth boundary. And I'm sort of curious as to why the border stops at 29th but doesn't go to 50th?

LEIN: Mr. Lee, any response to that at this point?

LEE: No. I think it probably is evidenced based on existing demand in that area, the fairgrounds area, that is the reason why.

BATEMAN: I mean if 179th Street is going to be widened, then it only seems logical that at that juncture there's already water but that sewer then be included through all of this, through all of that where 179th Street is being expanded so that would then make it possible to have further development go forward and in this, in this area from 29th to 50th so that's --

LEIN: Mr. Dust, do you have anything to add to that?

DUST: For the record, Evan Dust, Long-Range Planning. 179th is under design right now with the Public Works Department for a widening that would be consistent with the policy direction contained in the County's Arterial Atlas. That policy direction came with the adoption of the Salmon Creek Fairgrounds Regional Road Plan and that is for a five lane section within the current urban growth boundary as adopted in 1994 and a three lane urban section beyond that boundary point to 50th. The logic behind that is that the area was seen as likely to come in during that, that planning process, recognizing that

the recommendations contained in the Salmon Creek Fairgrounds Regional Road Plan were those developed by a citizen committee and forwarded to for Planning Commission and Board consideration.

BATEMAN: Okay.

LEIN: Thank you, I guess. Okay. Any other questions? Thank you.

BATEMAN: Thank you.

MOSS: We had another request in this same area, don't we, from the Battle Ground School District?

LEIN: From Battle Ground School District?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

MOSS: I think it's the parcels to the right there, isn't it? Those, right.

LEIN: Anyone else wishing to testify on a site-specific issue? If not, we will take about a five to seven minute break and then we'll come back and, Mr. Lee, we'll start on comp plan text.

LEE: Comp plan text.

LEIN: Okay, thank you.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: We'd like to reconvene the hearing. And at this time I will turn it over to Mr. Lee for a brief staff presentation on some information that we had in a workshop prior to this hearing.

LEE: Yes, I think in the interest of time we'll try to keep it as brief as we had it in the work session, but for the benefit of those in the audience that were not at the work session they should hear a little bit about the countywide planning policies and in general the changes to the comp plan text and Oliver will present that.

ORJIAKO: Thank you, Pat, and thank you members of the Planning Commission. For the record, Oliver Orjiako with the Clark County Long-Range Planning Staff. As Pat indicated I will be very short. I went through some of the changes that we made to the plan text as part of this plan update and they are not substantial in nature, I will not go in depth in terms of some of those changes, but I will summarize the policies that are new.

Before that I just want to indicate that back in March of this year we did provide the public with the first eight chapters of the document indicating some of the changes that were made as part of the update and that document had underline and strike outs, it was also made available to the Planning Commission. At that time we did not have four chapters available, the land use, the economic development, capital facilities plan and the transportation element. Part of the reason was that we didn't have the proposed plan that you'll be reviewing at that time available and when that plan was made available, at least we got the direction from the Board in July, we then went ahead to complete the four chapters that I mentioned. So when the public got this back in March they did not have those four chapters, but since September 18th those chapters have been incorporated and was also made available. It is at every local library in the county since September 18th.

What I will do is go straight to the new countywide planning policies that is new since the plan was adopted in '94. I think the Planning Commission I will go first to the Section 215 policies that the Planning Commission recommended for adoption to the County Board of Commissioners which was adopted by the Board back in June of 2000. Those four countywide planning policies deal primarily with the GMA legislation that calls for a review and evaluation by Clark County and the local jurisdiction reviewing the criteria and assumption that the '94 plan was based on to actually see what have developed and how close we are with those assumptions and criterias and then using that as part of a process to update the plan. When that plan was, when those policies was adopted in 2000 it was deferred for incorporation into the plan update when the County Board of Commissioners adopt this plan later this year. For the interest of time I will not go in depth, but if you're interested those policies are on Tab 3 in your packet Page 1-19 if you're interested in reviewing those.

The second countywide planning policy that came out of this planning process which we have reviewed with each of the local jurisdiction has to deal with the housing densities and housing split. When I talk about housing density, if you recall the '94 plan calls for 6 units, 8 and 16 units per acre, single-family 8 and multi-family 16 units. That density was tiered as part of this process 8 average density for Vancouver urban growth area, 6 for Camas, Battle Ground, Ridgefield and Washougal and 4 to La Center and no standard at all for the town of Yacolt because of wastewater management issues. In addition if you'll remember or recall the '94 plan called for a housing split of 60/40, 60 percent being single-family and 40 percent multi-family. That policy was also recommended for modification and it calls for no more than 75 percent of the new housing stock being of a single product type, single-family detached residential or attached multi-family. Again, this change would not be applicable to the town of Yacolt because they don't have the sewer.

The other major policy that we worked with the local jurisdictions to make countywide planning policy is the rural industrial land bank legislation that was passed in 2000, that has a two part to it, one if you have a user it doesn't require any consultation with the

local jurisdictions, the industrial land bank part of that legislation requires some consultation with the local jurisdictions. We have combined the two legislation to draft a countywide planning policy which the Cities have reviewed in agreement that we should have that policy. One thing that I may mention is that you heard some testimony last week from Mr. Horenstein dealing with the industrial land bank asking that the Ridgefield Junction, this policy will guide us in making that a reality if the County chooses. Bob Higbie will get into some of the language we have in terms of if an application comes in, what process would the County use in reviewing such proposal. That is part of this language that we are proposing.

The other policy language that we worked very hard, when I said very hard we did but we could not reach a consensus with the local jurisdiction, and that has to deal with the no net loss policy. We couldn't make it a countywide planning policy. You heard testimony last week and prior to that from some of the local jurisdiction. Battle Ground in particular you heard their testimony that they don't want any part of the no net loss policy. You heard some testimony from the City of Ridgefield, from Camas that they like the concept, but they would like it to be employee based type of policy. Throughout those discussion we couldn't reach some consensus of what the County language is going to look like.

As you are probably aware, the no net loss came about as a result of the '94 plan on the premise that the county has too much industrial land and as such we were remanded on that to develop some development regulation to guide the County if indeed we want those areas to develop as industrial. In other words, put some development regulation in place to protect those industrial land from nonindustrial use. As part of this process you are familiar with what we've done so far, this update is more job intensive, if you will, and we have designated additional industrial land in addition to what we currently have in the urban growth boundary. And in proposing that the other Cities consider this policy, we felt that it is important not that we are going to be remanded, that's not the fear, but if we are going to be bringing this additional industrial land into the urban growth boundary, it ought to be used for industrial purposes and therefore a need to have some development regulation to protect it, whether it is under the County jurisdiction or annexed to the city, I don't think we have a policy in front of you to consider.

The County currently have a no net loss of industrial land in our existing plan. The City of Vancouver have proposed a similar no net loss policy in their own comprehensive plan. It is up to the Planning Commission what you would like to recommend to the Board. You can recommend that each of the Cities consider some form of a development regulation on how to protect majority of the industrial areas that we are bringing in as part of this update, but that's one area that we couldn't reach a consensus on. As we go through the code there are some code language that Bob will probably get into if we have time tonight that will probably find its way into the comp plan text. I will not go into detail on those, I will leave it up to Bob when he gets into that discussion,

that has to deal with the language on urban holding. As you're probably aware, we have an existing urban holding language in the '94 plan, that has been modified somehow addressing certain issues. It has some language dealing with no net loss, some Cities don't want it, but in whatever form the Planning Commission recommends the urban language to be, we will address and put that in the Chapter 12 of the comp plan document.

One other area that I want to touch on quickly is that you may think that this is a new document, it is not, you've gone through it, we've done some really housekeeping on this, in some cases combining some policies to make it read clearer, in some cases it's, you know, a grammatical change and it is not an overhaul, we have pictures, it's more friendly, but we haven't changed it significantly to cause any alarm. The policies that I mentioned are the major ones that are new when you compare it to the '94 plan. And I will stop there in the interest of time. If you have specific questions, I will then do so.

One other point I want to make, not a point per se, but we did have one comment and that is, I passed it out during the work session, a proposed policy coming from Preston & Gates that represent the consortium of school district in the county. That policy as I indicated during the work session deals primarily not only to the County but also to the Cities that the County adopts a policy that reads "work cooperatively with school district to facilitate the provision of an adequate supply of K-12 public school facilities to avoid overcrowding and to enhance the educational opportunities for our children. Clark County and the cities in Clark County shall adopt regulations which are supportive of the permitting of public schools and K-12 facilities." As I mentioned at the work session, in our economic development section we do have a policy that address this similar policy language. If the Planning Commission wants to review that policy, you're free to do that. If you want to recommend this version be adopted, we will also consider that and take that to the Planning Commission -- to the Board. That summarizes my remarks on the plan text. If you have specific questions to any of this, then I will go into answering your questions.

LEIN: Ron, do you have a question?

BARCA: Since you brought up the document from Preston & Gates are we going to have testimony from them on this document?

ORJIAKO: Maybe. I'm only referring that that's the only policy text change that we heard from the public. There may be other folks testifying. I only brought it up because that's the only one we have since this was released.

LEIN: Any other questions of Oliver at this point? Okay. We'll take some public testimony on this particular issue. Mr. Horenstein.

HORENSTEIN: Good evening. My name is Todd Horenstein with the Vancouver

School District, Post Office Box 8937, that's Vancouver, Washington. Thank you for the opportunity to testify tonight. I'm going to abbreviate my testimony as best I can for this presentation, but I do have it in writing format that I will leave with staff so that you can have a full copy. The comprehensive plan discussion is about the future of Clark County. I would like to share with you a compelling perspective through many of our community's families and youths as to why your recommendation regarding our comprehensive plan policies and zoning regulations are so critical to the future health of Clark County and the public infrastructure that helps support our residents. I would also like to share with you lessons learned and recommendations by the Vancouver School District based on the effects of growth over the last 10 years.

Over two years ago when Clark County and the City of Vancouver began their respective comprehensive plan updates, the Vancouver School District proposed a community planning initiative intended to strengthen the ties between education, asset building and community development. The purpose of this initiative is to promote, one, a vision for strategic planning for community development; two, improving community quality of life through economic and social vitality; and, three, long-term sustainability of quality education for learning success opportunities. The words "comprehensive plan update" bring to many of us the issues of land use, transportation and water and sewer, not public schools. Public schools seem somehow in a separate category, although no one would argue that our most valuable possessions are our children. Whether students are well-served in our schools is important in a different way from traffic safety or reduced commute time. Community livability necessitates raising education issues to a high level of policy awareness.

Demographics change, with demographic change within the Vancouver School District and the Vancouver urban growth area has been profound. Increased population, increased poverty, increased student mobility, loss of family wage jobs and concentration of high density, low cost housing are all factors contributing to this change. Sustaining a high quality community educational system in light of these issues is paramount. Demographics statistics for the Vancouver School District in the Vancouver urban growth area reveal that elementary school enrollment outside the urban core, meaning the city limits but within the Vancouver UGA, increased by 19 percent between 1990 and 2000. Students qualifying for free reduced price lunches, the federal indicator of poverty, increased by approximately 70 percent during that same time period. Over one-third of elementary students outside the urban core qualify for free or reduced price lunches today and student turnover rate is approximately 25 percent of the enrollment.

Land use policies impacts the quality of life. The land use issues that are of primary interest to Vancouver School District include increasing family wage jobs, supporting development of neighborhoods that have a variety of housing types and prices, integrating educational impacts into the policy and planning process and monitoring progress over time. We applaud the efforts of the Commission to implement policies

that will increase the number of sustainable family wage jobs in Clark County. We agree that there is a need to provide an adequate supply of industrial and commercial land in urban areas. We also need to increase the amount of commercial and industrial development to offset the disproportionately high amount of residential development that has occurred.

Due to the housing policies of the 1994 plan, high density, low cost housing is being concentrated within the Vancouver urban growth area. After nine years of GMA enactment and since the Vancouver School District is almost entirely within the Vancouver UGA, it is appropriate to examine this housing concentration and its impact over time on student learning and economic and political support for our schools. A top-notch school district is a quality of life issue for a community. GMA policies need to actively promote excellent schools. Neighborhoods that have a variety of housing types and prices allow economically disadvantaged children into mainstream middle class communities. This same research indicates significant improvements in learning success under these conditions. In addition, family stability such as homeownership, affordable mixed housing, family wage jobs, accessible transportation system, produces a low student turnover rate and increases student achievement.

Future of growth must be guided by comprehensive plan policies and zoning and development regulations that nurture and strengthen community, health and economic vitality through appropriate housing, jobs, transportation and public infrastructure systems that create an environment in which each individual will succeed. The newly adopted comprehensive plan must be guided by quantitative criteria. What do our demographics tell us about how we are growing, not only quantitative criteria, and must include an annual evaluation process to determine if the community is growing in a healthy fashion, and if not, accommodations to the plan should be made to avoid extending the current negative demographic trend.

The Vancouver School District recommends that two additional elements be added to the 20 year plan. These elements refer to, one, the learning community, and, two, benchmarks of progress. We are proposing that two additional chapters be added to the plan. For the sake of the testimony tonight we've identified them as Chapter 13 and Chapter 14. That may not be properly placed, but in keeping with the plan as it stands today with 12 elements. I'd like to share those two in a little more detail with you. Proposed Chapter 13 that speaks of the learning community acknowledges that although this element is not required by the Growth Management Act, Clark County's cities and towns refer to their schools as essential to the livability of the local community. The following policies are to coordinate with other planning elements to ensure life-long individualized learning success as well as sustaining the education infrastructure vital to a prosperous community.

These policies would include, one, policies should be implemented to encourage mixed income owned housing and stable neighborhoods, supporting continuous enrollment in

one school and a sense of belonging to one's neighborhood. Low student turnover increases student achievement. Two, implement policies that focus on strengthening and diversifying Clark County's economic base and the necessary learning opportunities to ensure high employment and family wage jobs for our citizens. There is a direct relationship between income and stability and improved learning. Three, adopt policies to encourage the development of necessary support structures, programs and facilities that nurture the positive educational and social development and physical, mental health of our community citizens. Such educational and social development and health are tied to learning success. Particular attention should be given to child-care, family support and network computer technology accessible to all residents. Four, call upon the educational community to provide quality life-long learning opportunities to students of all ages, including early learning, K-12, higher education, community education, career advancement and work force preparedness training. And, fifth, facilitate partnerships in collaboration among educational institutions, cities, county, business and neighborhoods, community service organizations, all for the to -- all to support the learning community in pursuit of life-long learning opportunities and learning success.

Chapter 14 proposed addresses the evaluation of how we are growing, how we are doing, it's titled Benchmark of Progress. This planning, or excuse me, planning documents require ongoing evaluation, assessment and modifications to remain an effective tool for sustaining quality healthy communities. Policies under the Benchmark of Progress chapter would include, one, implement benchmarks of progress to develop, implement and monitor progress in achieving the planning targets; two, analyze key demographic indicators that address both quantitative and qualitative measures of progress, and, three, assess and report annually to the community on the progress and future plans to create and sustain improved quality of life anticipated by the community framework plan elements.

The essence of the testimony from the school district is clearly as we've experienced growth over the last 10 years, there had been some unintended negative indicators and we believe in part because the plan in 1994 did not adequately address the quality of growth. We believe that that issue must be taken head on or we will continue to experience growth in the negative sense that we have experienced in the core of our school district and see evidence of it expanding out into the urban area. We believe that the document, our guiding planning document, should include other institutions such as public school systems in order to help monitor and evaluate the quality of our growth over time. So respectfully we'll, and I will leave you with a copy of the testimony, and request consideration for the two chapters, additional chapters that I outlined today be considered in your deliberations in the future decision. Thank you.

LEIN: Questions of Mr. Horenstein?

BARCA: Go ahead.

RUPLEY: No, go ahead.

BARCA: All right then. Thank you. Hearing what you're speaking about and understanding the direction you're going, you spoke about life-long education and the aspect of education partnerships and then you moved down into the aspect of benchmarking. I'm wondering rather than throwing out these chapters for future reference if you could help spearhead the opportunity to take the educational infrastructure that's in place all the way up through the college system and down into the high schools and provide some of the necessary work that it takes to develop these benchmarks. Knowing that we're all working in a cheaper, faster, better world where budgets don't normally allow for expanded roles such as this, perhaps that partnership could be developed from your side and in conjunction with the County and the City of Vancouver maybe kick this thing off that you're talking about.

HORENSTEIN: We have been hoping and willing to do that over the last two years. We have been participating with staff on the Technical Advisory Committee. We've had the opportunity to share much of this information with staff over the last at least year, if not longer, and do see elements of our concerns particularly in the housing chapter that have been included, but we made ourselves available at that time, we'll continue, we'd appreciate the opportunity to work together to develop these kinds of policies that we believe are necessary for quality of life in Clark County, absolutely.

BARCA: Maybe more of a leadership type role is what it actually takes to kick it off and I'm not thinking that your organization by itself but in conjunction with the higher education, you probably have the necessary planning credentials there to go ahead and actually craft a program such as what you're talking about and then presenting it to the public sector might be a faster way to go.

HORENSTEIN: Well, we'd be happy to work with staff on whatever mechanism that they feel would be most appropriate. Recognizing it is a County document, planning document, we're not asking to become the planners for the county, but we certainly would like to have the opportunity to input on the educational components and be more than happy to do so.

LEIN: Ms. Rupley.

RUPLEY: Todd, it's my understanding that actually the Vancouver School Board did meet with the County Commissioners to share some of these ideas --

HORENSTEIN: Correct.

RUPLEY: -- what, a year ago --

HORENSTEIN: At least a year --

RUPLEY: -- somewhere around there?

HORENSTEIN: -- a year and a half probably, yes.

RUPLEY: Okay. One of the questions that I asked when we had testimony from the Cities in terms of some of their plans was were they working with their school district and I guess I want to take that opportunity to ask you that question in terms of how much time and effort did the City of Vancouver spend with you in terms of them presenting their plan for input from you?

HORENSTEIN: Like County staff, we did spend a significant amount of time with City staff. We have made presentations to City Council. We made some of our presentations to the City planning commission. But we have been a part of the technical team for the City and their planning effort for their comp plan update and have shared the very similar information. As you might imagine, the statistics are even that much more telling within the core of the city, but still the essence is the same and we have been invited and participated with their -- in their discussions.

RUPLEY: Do you think that their planning and their proposal coming forward reflects your input to the degree you want it to?

HORENSTEIN: Elements, no, but elements are there. And we haven't seen the draft to the extent that we can tell all of the elements are there, but we would like to see more as well and with the City of Vancouver.

RUPLEY: And I'm asking you these questions because I think you reflect all of the school districts and probably in my questions to all of the Cities that interaction has not happened to the level that I feel needs to happen in terms of future planning and how growth affects schools and families. So thank you very much for that testimony.

HORENSTEIN: You bet. Thank you.

LEIN: Mr. Horenstein, perhaps an unfair question, but I work with other school districts, do other school districts in Camas, Ridgefield, Battle Ground who aren't as large, are they experiencing some of the same situations to your knowledge?

HORENSTEIN: Less, less so certainly than the Vancouver School District has experienced. And I would like to clarify for the record that this is a Vancouver School District position, although we do partner with the other districts through the consortium on a number of issues and some of the testimony tonight I believe will reflect the consortium. This is not an official consortium testimony, this is the Vancouver School District. We believe that many of the other surrounding school districts have been faced with other challenges, probably the demographics being less so than in Vancouver just

by the nature of the growth in the community, but we have had discussions with other school districts sharing with them our experiences, how we see the current planning in the County is directing a lot of that demographic trend and sharing with them some of the concerns that we've had in hopes that they will be able to be in front of the planning process if they so desire to address these in advance.

LEIN: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you.

LEIN: Mr. Snodgrass, do you want to make some comments at this point?

SNODGRASS: Not to this issue. To the policy issues.

LEIN: Okay. Denise Stiffarm.

STIFFARM: Thank you. I'm Denise Stiffarm, I'm here on behalf of the Clark County School Consortium, and for the record my address is 222 SW Columbia Street, Portland. Obviously Mr. Orjiako has done a good job of getting the language in front of you that we have requested be added as a policy. Mr. Horenstein also just explained to you the importance of schools and school facilities to the community and as a part of the comprehensive plan process we are here to request that the language be added. And the GMA requires that adequate public infrastructure, including schools, be in place at the time development occurs and your comprehensive plan obviously follows the GMA, and as you consider the capital facilities element in the coming weeks, maybe tonight, but probably in the coming weeks, you'll note that there is the school districts' component of that and that schools are planning for that. Another thing is with regard to the Final Environmental Impact Statement that was issued by the County, you'll note that the projections of additional students under the preferred alternative is about 20,000 and that includes 30 new schools that would need to be in place to serve those new students.

That brings us to the policy language. We are aware that there is existing language in the comp plan that is specific to schools. And just to refresh everyone's memories, Policy 9.5.3 says that a policy of the County is to encourage improvement of the region's educational network. A very simple policy and a good one, but frankly it's not going far enough, it's not specifically addressing facilities issues, it's not requiring that there be mechanisms in place to ensure that school facility siting is done in a cost effective and a timely manner to meet the population needs of the county. For those reasons we've suggested the new policy language and we're amenable to having that put into the existing policy or set out as a policy on its own. So we're here to urge your consideration of that matter tonight. I have one other issue, but if there's any specific questions on that I would be happy to take them now. No.

The other thing that the consortium wanted to bring to your attention is just to urge support for the urban holding ordinance. And this again is from a planning perspective that this will allow school districts first to catch up to the growth that's already occurred and then to have an idea of when a City does go forward to annex rural residential areas that they will be required to demonstrate that urban services, including schools, will be in place to serve that. You've heard Lynn Hicks from the Battle Ground School District speak to this several weeks ago and again urging support for that and it's all from a planning perspective allowing school districts the ability to recognize where the growth is occurring and to be able to adequately serve and provide strong neighborhood schools.

LEIN: Any comments or questions?

RUPLEY: Have you reviewed the proposed City plans for the various cities in terms of how they affect school districts?

STIFFARM: Yes.

RUPLEY: You have. And I'm sitting here hearing that you're saying 30 new schools and if my last straw poll I don't have that information, but I think that there may be 6 in terms of some of the zoning that I saw as we were looking at those plans.

STIFFARM: Right. And let me back up. And that's over the entire 20-year period that in order to serve under the preferred alternative, to be able to serve the projected 20,000 new students, it would require 30 new schools. Obviously the school districts haven't gone to the point of actually planning for those developments because they're waiting to see if in fact that does occur.

RUPLEY: Okay.

LEIN: Any other questions? Thank you.

STIFFARM: Thank you.

LEIN: I think that's the only other person I have on the sign-up for the policies issue. Is there anyone else wishing to testify on the policy issue?

HADLEY: I'm Ken Hadley, I live at 1317 NE 4th Avenue in Camas, Washington. I wanted to make some comments about the proposal we just heard from the school district on Chapter 13 and 14. It seems to me this is pretty late in the process to be recommending new chapters to the comp plan. I don't know how you're going to have a public process to vet the information. For instance, nobody has a copy of it except you people. Just listening to it, some of the things sound like they don't really belong in a comp plan, maybe they would be good policy for the City of Vancouver, which probably

is more involved with the Vancouver School District, but I just am bothered by the fact that I don't think you can have a public process now on these proposed new chapters, it's just too late in the process. I would like to have some comments from staff about how they would be able to do that.

You might remember that in 1994 at the last minute we threw in a big change about zoning without a public process that was eventually thrown out by the court and this is supposed to be something that's been discussed over a two-year period with the public and here at the last minute we have what sounds to me like an important addition. So I'd like to hear some comments about how this could be properly discussed with the public and get so that the public can see the thing and try to understand the full impact. But just from what I've heard, I'll repeat, some of this doesn't sound like it should really be in a comp plan. Okay. Thank you.

RUPLEY: Mr. Hadley, I have a question. How would you address some of the concerns that you're hearing in the testimony that's come throughout in terms of planning for future growth for students if you were the school districts?

HADLEY: You mean facilities for the new students?

RUPLEY: Facilities and also looking at some of the zoning issues and growth issues in terms of how it affects students.

HADLEY: Well, I'll say from my personal experience that I don't think the school districts in general have been as involved with the public processes as they should be. I know that at a lot of the meetings, at least early on, they didn't seem to be there presenting their needs and their desires as they should have been. But in terms of planning for new students, they're on the same level as the rest of us, the County Commissioners pick a population figure and there's a lot of us that disagree and think that's much too low, so they have to do an estimate of what's coming down. I don't know, listening to this I can't tell if there's a mandate in there for Counties and Cities to provide a certain level of facility and I don't know how that would work so I don't understand what's being proposed at all. But some of the things having to do with facilities apparently are controlled by the State, not the County comp plan.

In terms of zoning, I've heard the discussion of mixed housing for some time. I don't understand exactly how it's proposed that the County zoning would ensure that. Some of these things are put forward as a desire, but there's no discussion about how they would actually be put into policy and I -- there's some discussion about trying to keep people in the same school throughout their learning life, but the school districts when they need to shift people out of one school into another all the time over the objections of parents and people in the neighborhood. So there are things that they do that are disruptive also and I would like to hear more proposals from them about exactly how to put policies into place to get this mix of -- ensure the mix of housing and the stability that

they're asking for. It's a good idea but I can't see just how you're going to enforce it.

RUPLEY: From my experience, usually when school districts change boundaries to do what you just spoke to, it's usually due to growth and it's usually due to development that overcrowds a single school which necessitates them moving students to another one, so I think that's probably one of the prime examples that you see of how growth affects. For example that my family might go to one school for two years, move to another one and move to another one due to the growth boundaries. So to me that's almost a perfect example of why there should be some really close coordination. I think back a few weeks the City of Battle Ground you would think that the schools are probably the largest employer in Battle Ground, as well as the user of facilities and things like that, and there had been -- the City planner's response to mine was the people of Battle Ground will decide what they want to do for schools and I don't know that that's a real visionary approach to be able to look at what we're looking at here so.

HADLEY: Well, again I'm going to say something that's not going to be popular, but I think the school districts should be taking a much more active approach to the Cities about their needs and to demand that the City work with them, but I think that there's a big failure on the part of the schools to try to be a strong proponent or somebody that's working with the system to see that their needs have been fully discussed.

RUPLEY: I think you'll see that in every case they've all been in front of their Cities with testimony and requests as we look through some of the record, so they have at least been there.

HADLEY: Well, they've made some requests, but I don't -- my experience is of course more with Camas because that's where I live, been in the steering committee meetings and the many things I've attended for several years with the County, they come and they say, well, we're going to have a bunch of kids, we're going to need facilities, but to be there with details and a strong request for specific cooperation from the Cities I really haven't seen that. Now I'm glad to see that they're getting more involved, it just bothers me that it's pretty late in the process here.

RUPLEY: Thanks.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Hadley. Any other comments?

BARCA: May I redirect to the consortium, please, Ms. Stiffarm. I hope I said that all right. Denise. Thank you.

STIFFARM: It's just as it sounds, it's a weird name.

BARCA: In looking at the document that you supplied us it's actually labeled Preston Gates & Ellis.

STIFFARM: Is that the October 2nd letter?

BARCA: October 2nd document, yeah. I'm going all the way to Table 65c looking at the ratio of a residential to commercial, industrial lands, trying to understand, the point here being that the better the balance, then the better the tax base for supporting the schools. Based on Mr. Horenstein's testimony there's also a component of family wage jobs and a certain level of income and that coupled with, let me go back to my notes for a moment, a variety of housing types and the negative demographic trends, it may be helpful to me specifically if those demographic trends that are deemed a negative if you could develop kind of the same type of graphic that you did for the industrial versus residential --

STIFFARM: Sure.

BARCA: -- and show us that relationship also. When it comes to Mr. Hadley's testimony of trying to understand how you do that, I think the very first aspect for me would be to understand where that's occurring and how much there really is in the way of options for that particular area, whether there is an opportunity to change up the variety of housing that's there or to make some commercial lands available in a specific area. So I know I'm asking you to submit additional information but --

STIFFARM: That's fine, we're happy to do it. Yes, we'll put that together and submit it through the staff to you.

BARCA: I appreciate that. Thank you.

RUPLEY: Denise, one other thing. I think that Ron also had some conversation when Todd Horenstein was testifying about looking at a group of people together to be able to do that. Is that something maybe the consortium is also willing to look at so that Vancouver doesn't have to step out all by themselves with that?

STIFFARM: We -- well, certainly as a group we do discuss the siting issues and facility issues and the growth issues and this is something that we can bring back to the group to talk through. And Todd's a member and attends all the meetings so he can help us present that to them. But I think as a general note, the members of the consortium are very much in line with Todd's comments regarding the need to measure growth as it's occurring and ensure that adequate school facilities are there and that they really are the heart of the community, not only for purposes of education but obviously they tend to be the local gathering spot as well. But we can definitely talk more specifically with that with the consortium.

RUPLEY: I actually think from my perspective is as we begin to do our deliberations that concerns of the various schools specifically would help me as I look at some of the

planning and the things that we're going to look at.

STIFFARM: Okay.

RUPLEY: Thanks.

LEIN: Is there any other testimony? Bryan.

SNODGRASS: Good evening. I'll be brief. For the record, Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver. I'll just provide our written material which does (inaudible) --

LEIN: Bryan, you're fading out as you're walking around, we have someone who would like to hear your voice. Thank you.

SNODGRASS: Oh, talk slow I guess. I think the hour will sort of help there. We do have some written comments coming around. The first thing on them is capital facilities, which obviously I won't go into but we will do so next week. We did want to talk a little bit about the urban holding issue and then kind of in follow-up to some testimony you heard recently a bit more on some of the assumptions issues, particularly the covenants issues that was raised and some of the infrastructure assumptions issues that were raised.

Speaking to urban holding, and there's obviously been some discussion on that, I think from our perspective it's -- as you've heard from the school districts and others, it's main importance and the main reason we're advocating for it is to have some form of subarea planning to allow for on-the-ground provision of facilities and zoning issues, but particularly facilities, that none of this process really has allowed to date as we convert areas that are now rural or consider converting them to residential or commercial or industrial urban uses. Certainly this is not new and that was discussed at the work session the sort of past history with urban holding. I think we'd also want to point out it's not contrary to the Growth Management Act as I think has been alleged previously. GMA does require that these lands within boundaries be available over the course of the 20-year period, it doesn't require that they be available all at once. And in fact it has sort of general language encouraging just the opposite. It has a provision encouraging growth to occur first in existing areas where there's existing services, then in areas after that that have, that are not yet served or not yet characterized by urban development.

The proposal that the County staff has put before you does not purport to treat Vancouver exactly the same as the other cities. Certainly its size and history are going to mean that things are going to be a little bit different for our UGA. One of the things that it does differently is it doesn't try to apply urban holding to all of the unincorporated areas as all the other Cities do have now, it's focused on the new expansion areas wherever they may be coming in at this point. It also more so than the other Cities would emphasize a subarea plan as a means of lifting the urban holding, it would not

require that those lands be left in an uncertain limbo for 20 years or any other period.

I think it's also important to emphasize it wouldn't give Vancouver effective veto power over what goes on in those areas, it would give Vancouver, I think, a seat at the table. And certainly our reading of some of the policies that are in the community framework plan that you're proposing tonight to bring into your comprehensive plan already talk about issues such as joint planning that we think this needs to follow through on. So our -- certainly our recommendation, and if there's further discussion about streamlining the language of urban holding that may be appropriate, but our strong recommendation is that if these areas are to be expanded into, and we prefer that they not be, that some form of a substantive urban holding that does provide most importantly for that subarea planning but also it does give Vancouver a seat at that table when that planning occurs, happen. So and I can take any questions on that or at the end of the testimony.

The other issue we want to talk a little bit about is the assumptions, both some of the kind of particular issues that were raised recently and also the broader issues of land supply which obviously will have a profound impact on how much growth occurs and how much growth we plan for. One of the things that the Board did at their most recent hearings this past summer was that they did update the residential assumptions quite a bit. It seemed to us that when it came to the commercial and industrial after that, that it was just a matter of running out of gas and time and so we would -- whether I guess you would agree with us or not, we would urge that the Planning Commission at least consider some of the commercial and industrial requests that we have in terms of the assumptions and make your decision and recommendations.

Market factor has obviously been talked about quite a bit. Our concern is that the Growth Management Act already builds in a large automatic market factor, you're not -- you're required to set out a 20 year supply, you then are required to update that every 10 years, you also have the option of doing so as frequently as once every 5, and so in terms of land supply issues we think the importance of that can't be overstated. The main problem with market factor not so much is that it's redundant, but that when a large amount of land is added and the amount of growth that would occur and will occur in those areas isn't counted in any of the other planning, you have a problem. And to some extent this problem has already been acknowledged in the process to date. Right now in the countywide transportation modeling is working off a different set of assumptions than the countywide UGA sizing. The transportation modeling does assume that all of these lands will be built out so it is assuming higher totals. And so again, we just hope that you have a chance to deliberate the market factor issue. If you do choose to retain it, one of the other issues to address is do we want one set of assumptions for one thing, another for a different purpose. Our attorneys are advising us that's a very difficult issue and so you may -- we would urge you to look into that as well.

Other assumption issues I think we've talked about are pretty straightforward.

Employment density, all we're suggesting is use the County study. It said that the County buildable lands report said that countywide residential, or excuse me, commercial and industrial development is occurring at about 22 jobs per gross acre commercial, 10 industrial. When you look at that in net matter it's 29/13 jobs per acre, we just hope you use those County numbers. Business expansion/redevelopment, again we've discussed this before, the VBLM's current assumption is that only 5 percent of future job growth will occur through businesses expanding within their existing as well as remodeling it within their site, that kind of thing.

We looked at this issue for a two-year period and found in the '96 through '98 period that about 41 percent of Vancouver UGA jobs were occurring through expansion redevelopment. We checked with METRO across the river as of at least a year ago, it's been a while since I've checked on this particular assumption, they were at about the same number, about 40 percent, so again we just hope you have a chance to deliberate the point and if you do choose a number, have some justification behind it. Right now we're unaware of any supportive documentation for a 5 percent commercial, industrial redevelopment, we think most of the information out there says it's a lot higher.

Certainly for work at home issues, again the current assumptions assume nobody works at home and so we would suggest a small assumption based on what we've seen in the past census and what technology trends are so.

LEIN: Excuse me, Bryan, could you get maybe closer to the microphone.

SNODGRASS: Sure. On the residential side, as I said, the Board did do some updating which we appreciated to bring in recent data and so forth.

A couple of issues raised recently that we wanted to respond to, some I think both from our perspective good and bad concerns were raised. Regarding infrastructure percentage, I guess a couple of things we wanted to clarify, and we circulated around tonight our study originally from 2000, we did include within that study off-site impacts, or off-site infrastructure, churches, parks, schools, things like that, we didn't fail to include it as alleged. And we also didn't improperly handle vacant lands in that area, we did include it, we assigned a percentage to it, also is alleged. I think equally importantly the Vancouver study wasn't the main reason behind the Board's choice, the County's own study choice earlier of subdivisions showed 27 and a half percent, that seemed to us to be the main reason why the Board arrived at 27 and a half percent. I think if I recall too there was also some supportive discussion in terms of previous County studies on proportionate share of infrastructure. Just looking at roads, that roads just as part of the picture were only coming in at about 17 percent. So we believe there's a lot of data out there, including ours, supporting around 28 percent.

Now we did look at some of the findings put together by James Howsley and the Olson study, those were higher numbers. We did look at, and you already received this from

them, this is the infrastructure that they on a citywide basis studied. And certainly we applaud the effort to look at it on a citywide basis, but you'll notice there's a number of areas in there that at least from our perspective shouldn't be considered infrastructure or if they are, are simply not going to occur in the expansion area in the same proportions we've seen in the past. For instance, shown here is the Port of Vancouver lands, you have lands that are the Port of Vancouver, excuse me, the Vancouver Lake Island, the Vancouver Floodplain Lowland areas, you also have areas such as the WSU Campus, Central Park, certainly those are infrastructure, will they -- are we going to see another four-year university in the expansion area of that size, probably not. We certainly will need some schools. Will we see as many State road facilities, probably not. Will we see new BPA lines and substations, again at a smaller level, but probably not comparable to what we've seen here. And so that's our major concern with some of the significantly higher numbers that their study found.

We also wanted to talk a little bit about the covenants issue. I think that was a very good observation on their part that none of us, I don't think any of the planners, had caught that before. What we looked at, and also what we've circulated to you tonight, is we looked at specifically there was a number of subdivisions that were cited as having restrictive covenants, and we looked at the ones in the Vancouver area, we did find that these encompass about 11 percent. When you consider the vacant lands amount that those subdivisions encompass, in other words if they're taken out of the inventory, they're about 11 percent of the total inventory in the Vancouver expansion area. So certainly not an insignificant amount but certainly not a huge amount.

We also looked specifically at the language of those and we found that about half have language specifically prohibiting covenants, another half have more ambiguous language. One of the ones that we looked at, for instance, talked about restricting one house per lot size, but then elsewhere in the covenant it said that only if additional lots were created they need to comply with a road agreement. So some question whether all of those over a 20 year, most over a 20-year period wouldn't develop. Most importantly, though, there's already an assumption within the VBLM that we believe addresses this and that's the underutilized assumption that says 30 percent of all underutilized residential lots will be eliminated from the inventory, so that does include as you saw a couple of weeks ago some lots that are smaller or a two and a half or three-acre lot that might have a house on it, but it also includes a 10-acre lot that would have a house in the corner, those are also losing 30 percent of their inventory, we think that more than covers the impacts of restrictive covenants. Nonetheless it is a good issue. I think if we had more time we would want to examine it on a bigger scale, but certainly our findings are that it's not -- in terms of percentages it's not taking out a whole lot of land.

A couple of I guess just in wrapping up sort of important big picture considerations on the land supply stuff. These are just individual assumptions, there's obviously many of them. When you do ground truth, the whole thing to see how many, when you put the

assumptions together, to us it's revealing that there continues to be a significant underestimation of growth capacity out there and overestimation of how much land you need. And the most recent work we did on that was this map here. What it's -- and let me enter just for the record if you want to look at it, here's one. If we could have made copies for everybody we would have. What we did with this is look at compare site-specific requests in the potential Vancouver expansion area with what the vacant lands analysis and the vacant lands model at least is saying should be available and we found that there's about -- according to our latest information on the site-specific request about 1,000 acres in the Vancouver expansion area, (inaudible) the existing UGA, but 1,000 acres subject to the kind of site-specific requests you've been hearing. Of those more than half of them are on lands that the vacant buildable lands model says won't develop for 20 years.

So to us that certainly was an eye-opener that it would be that much. You would expect some, it's a model, it's not perfect, but to us this suggests that there's a significant number of areas out there that are not being included in the inventory that really should and so we wanted to kind of, you know, we've talked a lot about these sort of individual assumptions and numbers, wanted to kind of look at it when you put it altogether in a big picture and I think this sort of -- we're trying to give you a sense of why when we say, well, Vancouver UGA can accommodate the type of growth that's projected to it and the overall goals of having a better job/housing balance and economic development why that can be accommodated with modest expansions and not the kind of large ones that are proposed.

DELEISSEGUES: Bryan, could you just read the legend there and what the colors represent just so we can get an understanding of that?

SNODGRASS: Sure. These are sort of some of the terms that are in the vacant lands model here on the bottom. So the colors show lands that the vacant lands model considers part of the inventory, will get developed in the next 20 years. They include residential vacant, residential underutilized, commercial vacant, commercial underutilized, primary, secondary, tertiary, industrial. This sort of hatched mark here are the site-specifics and so normally we would expect to see more of the hatch marks appearing on the lands that the vacant lands model says are eligible and a few, although we'd expect some of the hatch marks appearing on a (inaudible) where the vacant lands model is saying that the land won't develop in 20 years. We found that most of them were appearing on lands that the vacant model was saying are not going to develop in 20 years and that seems to be a concern.

DELEISSEGUES: What's the primary reason that it won't develop in 20 years?

SNODGRASS: We don't know. I mean we didn't, you know, I assume some of it is coming out for critical lands purposes and some is coming out for tax exempt purposes and some is coming out because it's considered built under the model, but obviously the

applicants weren't informed of that, they're obviously thinking they can do some things here.

BARCA: So can I try and paraphrase what you're saying. You're saying that we've got individual landowners or representatives of those landowners are coming forward and asking to be included in the expansion area, but the computer model said that 56 percent of those specific parcels would not develop over the 20-year period?

SNODGRASS: Pretty close. That 56 percent of those in acreage terms coming forward are doing so on lands the computer model said were ineligible.

BARCA: That the model said. So what we're saying is, then, the model is being ultra conservative or is it just running in some bad assumptions on why they don't develop?

SNODGRASS: It's appearing quite conservative. I mean, you know --

BARCA: A conservative --

SNODGRASS: -- you'd have to look further as to each one as to why, but it would certainly appear to us quite conservative.

DELEISSEGUES: I just wonder what factors are programmed into the model, you know, that kick it out like economics, infrastructure, critical lands, maybe you can name a few, something like that?

SNODGRASS: That's probably, I'm guessing --

LEE: I actually think he hit the big ones. You're going to throw a lot of land out because it's tax exempt, designated as tax exempt property, you're throwing a lot of land out because it has critical land done in a very broad brush basis with buffers, fairly wide buffers, and then you have, I don't know, what's the third point you made?

SNODGRASS: That it might be built, that's it's already built.

LEE: Yeah, built. And actually there are, you know, quite a few because the "built" determination is based on valuation of the structure, not amount of lands available to build, but the valuation of the structure. So those three could be thrown out of the model as being buildable. And I think we would concur that (inaudible) conservative, but one point I would like to make if there's anything that I would like to avoid, though, we can go point, counterpoint, point, counterpoint through all this stuff, I think we ought to just stay away from that debate and look at the refinements that are being proposed by the Cities, by the site-specific users and try and develop a plan on that basis as opposed to getting hung up on the statistical analysis of the vacant buildable lands model.

BARCA: And while I appreciate your position I think there certainly is something to be said when we hit the capital facility side of this that says we're not going to be able to build all of the parcels that are on the map right now and in some fashion we're going to still need to accommodate the jobs and the additional population, either we tweak some numbers or we look at how much of the levels of services are going to be impacted in not just transportation but schools as we heard testimony on, et cetera, et cetera, I'm going to think that some of those assumptions will have to be revisited.

LEE: Well, we'll be prepared to the point, counterpoint when we get into that debate if you want to go there.

BARCA: Although I'll be gone next week so if you want to wrap that up. That was good TV, by the way, Bryan.

SNODGRASS: Yeah.

BARCA: Yeah. You probably just killed our ratings by holding that up in front of the camera backwards.

DELEISSEGUES: Yeah, our ratings were killed long before that.

RUPLEY: Ron needs to know we have no ratings, yeah.

WRISTON: We need two-sided maps.

BARCA: We have no ratings?

RUPLEY: No ratings.

BARCA: Compared to the ball game?

MOSS: I think your premise is flawed that we had somewhere to go.

WRISTON: Personally I appreciated being able to see that though, that's actually nice.

SNODGRASS: And just to follow up on Pat's point, we're not asking to reopen this. We would ask, though, that when you consider our request for a more modest expansion that we can accommodate most, if not all, of the growth projected for us within those modest expansions this is where we're coming from. I mean this is part of the reason we don't believe a large expansion makes some sense.

And I think there's one other land supply point, too, that I just think is worth mentioning as well. Obviously land supply is most influenced than any other factor by whatever

forecast is chosen and I think there continues to be a presumption that we're operating off of sort of a low end forecast now and I think with what, what the Board did this past summer is increased it substantially and I think that needs to be recognized and if -- perhaps even revisited. The increase in the total in the new population to be served which drives all of these expansions went up about 40 percent this last summer. We had been planning for a couple of years for about 115,000, we're now planning countywide for about 163,000 total people, so quite an increase. We're now planning for more people than the State thinks is most likely to occur here. The difference isn't huge, it's about 3 or 4,000 people, but we're now above what the State is saying is most likely, we are also now planning for more than what METRO is planning for for the region across the river, and whether you believe they're right or wrong, if one of the policy goals is to begin to reverse slowly but to begin to reverse the past trends of this area being a residential dumping ground, if you will, for the region, that's I think something to look at.

We're also now, we just did some recent calculations, in terms of the urban area of population to accommodate, we're talking about accommodating more people in the next 20 years here urban-wise than we did in the last 20. So I think when we think of impacts to schools and other things, that's certainly something we want to keep an eye on and I guess just decide if that's where you want to go as a policy matter. So all we would ask for the vacant lands, again, is just update the commercial and industrial assumptions. We didn't think the Board had a chance to do, so at least give them consideration. Maintain the residential as they are. Consider some of these I guess the overall extreme conservatism of the model in sizing the Vancouver UGA. So that's what we have.

LEIN: We've been directed not to ask you any questions so. Any questions of Mr. Snodgrass?

RUPLEY: I'd be interested in your comments on Vancouver School District's testimony earlier in terms of what you would like to say from the City perspective?

SNODGRASS: Well, I think that they have -- I think as Todd mentioned they have been invited and have participated in part of our process, Heidi Rosenberg has been part of the Vancouver Plan Oversight Committee. We did adopt a policy addressing school siting and working with the schools in our own comprehensive plan. I think we'll want to, I think what was -- what we heard tonight, what I heard, was a little more extensive in terms of additional stuff. So we'll want to sort of retouch, I think, with the school district to make sure we're okay with them, but certainly they've been an active part of our process.

RUPLEY: I think one additional point that when you talk about the population that you're looking at that's in excess of some of the other areas, I think the Oregon schools and some of the things that are happening there, probably some of the biggest reasons

why you're ending up with the people march across the bridge, that somehow needs to be addressed in your area too.

MOSS: Are you suggesting that we make the school situation worse here, Jada?

RUPLEY: Well, yeah, that's a good idea, Lonnie, let's think about that in the point, counterpoint. Thanks.

LEIN: Thank you, Bryan.

WRISTON: Thank you, Bryan.

LEIN: Anyone else wishing to testify on this particular issue?

MOSS: Why doesn't that surprise us.

RUPLEY: You don't have a notebook with you, do you?

HOWSLEY: No.

BARCA: All right, set the timer.

HOWSLEY: For the record, James Howsley, 601 SW 2nd Avenue, Suite 2100, Portland, Oregon 97204. Thank you, Chair and members of the Planning Commission. I just wanted to take a minute to respond to a couple of items raised by Mr. Snodgrass and with the items that we've already submitted to you in regards to the infrastructure and the covenants. I just wanted to clarify a couple of points.

In the city study our main concern wasn't really with how they calculated it, it was just that they grouped all land use types together and that's how they arrived at the 28 percent and that's in derivation of how it's supposed to be treated underneath the County's comprehensive plan, they're supposed to be separated out by a land use category. When we did that, according to our study with the residential lands we came up with a 30 percent infrastructure deduction, and then using that same formula when we looked across the Vancouver UGA, yes, we did come up with a higher number. And if you can remember within our letter we did not advocate for that higher number, we advocated rather for the 38 percent, recognizing that uses such as Washington State University and the Port would -- may or may not come within the expansion areas. There will be a letter forthcoming from us probably sometime next week responding to the County's Plan Monitoring Report as well as METRO's study regarding what their findings were with the infrastructure deduction.

As far as the covenants go, we thank the City for recognizing our work. We would just like to say that it's just a sampling of what is out there, it's not necessarily meant to be

representative, but we do think that there's a large amount of subdivisions, particularly in the newer areas on the fringe, that do have these prohibitions against further subdivision and it's just something that the Planning Commission should consider through the adoption of a market factor. And I believe our recommendation was 10 percent and that was also to address some of the other issues that we raised in our letter. If there's any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Howsley?

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you. Anything else in terms of additional testimony on the comp plan issues? I think we need to take a little break, yes. Let's take about a five minute break. And then, Mr. Lee, the last item on tonight will probably be the code changes? Okay.

(Pause in proceedings.)

LEIN: Let's reconvene the meeting. Going on to our last topic for this evening. Mr. Higbie.

HIGBIE: Commissioners, Bob Higbie with Long-Range Planning. We have a series of code changes that we provided to you in a packet dated September 10th. They include changes to, well, changes to the urban holding zone basically to provide for increase, an option to have a 40-acre minimum lot size where areas added to the urban growth boundary that may have very large lots be zoned that way so that they're protected in that size until they're actually developed into urban uses. Mixed use. Mixed use is an existing zone, but it has not yet been applied to the ground. It was adopted in 1994. We're suggesting that where mixed use is applied to new areas of the urban growth boundary that the mixed use zone itself be applied to the property. The office campus and business park designations are also currently in the zoning ordinance. We've basically tried to combine them using the development standards and buffering that is found in the office campus. They differ between each other very little except for some of the uses are a little bit more intense in the business park zone and the business park zone allows taller structures than the office campus.

In-fill. The in-fill code was adopted for the first time about a year ago. There are a number of minor clarification type changes in it that we would like to see passed. The one big issue that we would like you to deal with is whether or not the in-fill code itself should apply in areas newly added to the urban growth boundary. The primary issue there is that developments of in-fill get a benefit, some of them get a benefit for avoiding, not making frontage improvements where there are no urban roads within the vicinity. By definition that land coming into the area, newly into the urban growth boundary, will not have any urban improvements by definition and therefore that is one concern of ours.

The other basic issue with urban holding is that we're recommending that it be applied to all of the land that is added to the urban growth boundaries in all of the cities. That's not been an issue historically with any of the cities except for the City of Vancouver because all of the other Cities annex as a general rule prior to allowing any development. Given the history of development in the Vancouver urban area that's not true and therefore there is special language that we handed out this evening that we would like to propose and it contains issues about how Vancouver would work with the County in dealing with those new urban areas and under what circumstances the urban holding would be removed from that land. And that concludes my presentation. Any questions?

LEIN: Any questions of Mr. Higbie?

BARCA: I'll wait until they're done. Excuse me, did you say that you were going to hand out something on the urban holding or was it --

HIGBIE: Yes, we handed that out at the work session.

BARCA: Okay. That specific language?

HIGBIE: Yes.

BARCA: With that one interesting aspect of the development of a new city is that --

HIGBIE: That would be an option, yes.

BARCA: Okay. Do we have a specific region in mind with that?

HIGBIE: Yeah, Hazel something, Hazel Dell.

AUDIENCE: Hazel Sound.

BARCA: Okay, thank you.

LEIN: Any other questions of Mr. Higbie? Don't have a sign-up sheet. We'll open it for public testimony.

MOYER: No wonder no one gets very close to this, it's a short length on it and you have to crouch. For the record, my name is William Moyer, vice president Pleasant Highlands Neighborhood Association. I live at -- where do I live at, I used to know, 14210 NE 47th Avenue. Sorry, it's late. I have a question really for Mr. Higbie and staff. If I'm reading this right you have a choice of either not being able to develop your land if you're urban holding 20 or 40 unless you can either be, A, annexed by the City of

Vancouver or you have provisions for various services and a provision for future annexation presumably by the City of Vancouver or you incorporate as a separate city and there is no fourth alternative; is that correct?

HIGBIE: Yes.

MOYER: Is that fair? Is it even reasonable? Vancouver, I'm not quite sure how far the city limits of Vancouver are from the lands adjacent to my neighborhood association, but there's a considerable body that would have to agree to annexation to have anything happen as far out as we are, so that doesn't seem very reasonable. It would seem that for those in unincorporated Clark County there ought to be an alternative available for development of people's lands in accordance with their wishes and this does not provide that. And that's all I had to say.

HIGBIE: Thank you.

LEIN: Thank you, Mr. Moyer. Anyone else wishing to testify?

HADLEY: Ken Hadley again, 1317 NE 4th Avenue in Camas. I don't have a copy of the proposed language for the residential in-fill modifications, just so I'm going to ask some questions. Number one, they talk about the definition of "in-full duplex," I thought that was pretty well-defined. I assume that you've given the Planning Commission written something that has all of these proposals in --

HIGBIE: Yes.

HADLEY: -- more detail?

HIGBIE: Yes. And I can make them available to you. In fact there were copies at the table earlier.

HADLEY: Well, maybe earlier. So some of the things here I don't understand what the problems would have been that have arisen so.

LEE: We'll get you a copy. I mean a lot of the parcel, a lot of the -- some of it's just terminology change because we used the term "parcel" or "lot" kind of interchangeably trying to make consistent language. In terms of substance I think the one substantive change that we are suggesting because of the issues that Bob raised in the staff report was the proposal at this point not to consider using the in-fill in the newly added areas because of the potential effects that might have on the circulation system out there.

HADLEY: Yeah, I don't have any great problem with that. I think in fact that the definition, the eligibility would -- most things in the new areas would not meet the

eligibility requirements for in-fill anyway. So I was just surprised that some of the things that you had indicated here had shown up as problems.

HIGBIE: I don't even think I want to use the term "problems," they were areas where there was some disagreement over what it meant or there was a term that was used in one place that was used slightly differently in another. I think once you'll read them you'll --

HADLEY: Okay. Well, I was -- since this is something that I was following and it hasn't been out too long I was interested in what the -- but in as far as the rural areas, like I said, I don't think most parcels would qualify anyway so I have no problem with (inaudible) them. Thank you.

LEIN: Is there any other public testimony? Then we will conclude the public testimony and the hearings for this evening. Next week we are at City Hall. The first item on the public hearing agenda will be capital facilities plans. We also will have a workshop at 5:00?

LEE: Yes.

LEIN: Also at City Hall?

LEE: Yes.

LEIN: Thank you.

HADLEY: What's going to be the subject of the workshop?

LEIN: Capital facilities plans.

LEE: I think we will also come back with some of the maps regarding potential boundary expansions and how you might want to take a look at those.

LEIN: Yeah. Oliver.

ORJIAKO: Yes, I know we are pressing for time. On Tab 4 of the -- in your packet September 10 Code Changes has to deal with what I touched upon when I made the presentation on the plan text dealing with the process which the County would utilize in reviewing industrial land bank. We would like the Planning Commission also upon review in making your recommendation that that also be forwarded to the Board for adoption. Those two, the policy, the countywide planning policy, and this process goes hand-in-hand. We just didn't want to omit that, it's fairly straightforward. I don't want to go in depth in terms of what it (inaudible), but we thought we'd mention that it's part of that. It is in your packet.

LEIN: So it's Tab 4; correct?

ORJIAKO: Yes.

LEIN: Okay. Thank you.

ORJIAKO: You're welcome.

LEIN: I have a question for next week. I understand that Ron won't be here and Jeff won't be here. Lonnie?

MOSS: I will.

LEIN: Jada?

RUPLEY: Yes, Chairman Lein.

LEIN: Thank you. Mr. Deleissegues?

DELEISSEGUES: Possibly, Chairman Lein.

LEIN: We will have a quorum it looks like. Okay. Any old business? New business?

LEE: Do you really want some? No. No.

LEIN: No? Okay. You'll bring us another notebook I know.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

None.

ADJOURNMENT

The hearing adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

All proceedings of tonight's hearing are filed in Clark County Community Development/Long Range Planning. The minutes can also be viewed on the Clark County Web Page at www.co.clark.wa.us/ComDev/LongRange/LRP_PCagenda.asp

Vaughn Lein, Chair

Date

Minutes Transcribed By:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

SW\Min10-16-2003